arXiv:1109.1072v1 [math.CA] 6 Sep 2011

The partial sum process of orthogonal expansion as geometric rough process with Fourier series as an example—an improvement of Menshov-Rademacher theorem

Danyu Yang[*] Terry J. Lyons[†]

September 7, 2011

Abstract

The partial sum process of orthogonal expansion $\sum_{n\geq 0} c_n u_n$ is a geometric 2-rough process, for any orthonormal system $\{u_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ in L^2 and any numbers $\{c_n\}$ satisfying $\sum_{n\geq 0}(\log_2(n+1))^2|c_n|^2<\infty$. For Fourier series, the condition can be strengthened to $\sum_{n\geq 0}\log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2<\infty$, which is equivalent to $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{|f(u)-f(v)|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|}dudv<\infty$ (with f the limit function).

1 Introduction

Rough path techniques are used in [8] to analyze the radial behavior of a harmonic function on the unit disk. It is proved that, when the boundary function in the log Sobolev space, the radial function is a 2-rough process when accompanied by its area. In this paper, we treat the nth partial sum of the orthogonal expansion of the boundary function as a process evolving with n and continuous on $[0,\infty)$ by interpolating on integers. More rigorously,

Definition 1 *$\{u_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is said to be an orthonormal system in L^2 and denoted as $\{u_n\}\in L^2$, if there exist measure space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mu)$ and Hilbert space $(\mathcal{V},\|\cdot\|)$, such that $u_n:(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mu)\to(\mathcal{V},\|\cdot\|)$ $\forall n\in\mathbb{N}$, and $\int_\Omega\langle u_n(\omega),u_m(\omega)\rangle\mu(d\omega)=\delta_{mn}$ $\forall n,m\in\mathbb{N}$. With spaces specified, we denote $\{u_n\}\in L^2((\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mu),(\mathcal{V},\|\cdot\|))$ or simply $\{u_n\}\in L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{V})$.*

Definition 2 *Suppose $\{u_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}\in L^2$, and $\{c_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of numbers. Then the partial sum process X of $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}c_n u_n$ is a continuous process indexed*

---

[*] University of Oxford and Oxford-man Institute, Email: yangd@maths.ox.ac.uk

[†] University of Oxford and Oxford-man Institute, Email: Terry.Lyons@maths.ox.ac.uk

by $[0,\infty)$*, got by defining for each* $\omega \in \Omega$*,*

$$X_n(\omega) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} c_k u_k(\omega), \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1}$$

and interpolating linearly between adjacent integers.

We will identify a condition on $\{c_n\}$, under which X is a rough path with finite 2-variation on the half line, almost everywhere on Ω and for every choice of orthogonal sequence. Of course, the null set depends on the orthogonal sequence.

Following is the definition of p-variation from Wiener[26], widely used in rough path theory ([14], [16], [15], [5]). (Intervals instead of points are used to simplify notations in our proofs.)

Definition 3 (Finite partition D_J) *Suppose* J *is a finite interval. Then a set of intervals* $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{n}$ *is said to be a finite partition of* J*, if* I_k *are disjoint, of positive length, and* $J = \cup_{k=1}^{n} I_k$*. Denote the set of finite partitions of* J *as* D_J*.*

Definition 4 (p-variation) *Suppose* $(\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ *is a Banach space, and* J *is a finite interval.* $\gamma : J \to (\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ *is continuous and* $p \in [1,\infty)$*. For finite interval* I*, denote* $\gamma(I) := \gamma(\sup_{t\in I} t) - \gamma(\inf_{t\in I} t)$*. Then the* p*-variation of* γ *on* J *is defined as*

$$\|\gamma\|_{p-var,J} := \left(\sup_{\{I_k\}\in D_J} \sum_k \|\gamma(I_k)\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{2}$$

When $p = \infty$*,* $\|\gamma\|_{\infty-var,J} := \sup_{s,t\in J} \|\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)\|$*.*
If γ *is defined on* $[0,\infty)$*,* $\|\gamma\|_{p-var,[0,\infty)} := \lim_{n\to\infty} \|\gamma\|_{p-var,[0,n]}$*.*

A continuous path γ is of finite p-variation iff it can be reparametrised to be $\frac{1}{p}$-Hölder continuous. The function $p \mapsto \|\gamma\|_{p-var,J}$ on $p \in [1,\infty]$ is non-increasing, and continuous where it is finite. It is clear that $\|\gamma\|_{p-var,[0,\infty)} < \infty$ for some $p \in [1,\infty)$ implies the existence of $\lim_{t\to\infty} \gamma(t)$. Thus, almost everywhere finiteness of 2-variation of partial sum process on the positive half line implies the existence of a limit function upto a null set. Therefore, our topic has a direct connection with a.e. convergence of general orthonormal series, which dates back to Weyl[25].

Definition 5 (Weyl multiplier for property p) *Suppose* $\{w(n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *is a sequence of positive non-decreasing numbers.* $\{w(n)\}$ *is said to be a Weyl multiplier for property* p*, if* p *holds for all orthogonal series* $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n u_n$*, for any orthonormal system* $\{u_n\}$ *in* L^2 *and any sequence of numbers* $\{c_n\}$ *satisfying* $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} w(n) |c_n|^2 < \infty$*.*

Not every orthogonal series with coefficients in l^2 is convergent. There exists an L^2 Fourier series which diverges a.e. after some rearrangement, [28]. In fact, for any complete orthonormal system in $L^2((0,1),\mathbb{R})$, there exists a continuous function, whose expansion diverges unboundedly almost everywhere after some rearrangement, [20]. Moreover, Banach[2] proved that, if we equip $L^2((0,1),\mathbb{R})$ with the metric

$$d(\{u_n\},\{v_n\}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{\|u_n - v_n\|_{L^2}}{1 + \|u_n - v_n\|_{L^2}},\ \|u\|_{L^2} = \left(\int_0^1 u^2(x)\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{3}$$

then the set of orthonormal systems, whose expansions of all bounded variation functions diverge unboundedly almost everywhere, is a G_δ and everywhere second category subset of $L^2((0,1),\mathbb{R})$.

The exact Weyl multiplier for almost everywhere convergence of general orthogonal series is found by Menshov[18] and Rademacher[22].

Theorem 6 (Menshov-Rademacher) *The orthogonal series* $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n u_n$ *converges almost everywhere, for any* $\{u_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \in L^2$ *and any sequence of numbers* $\{c_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *satisfying*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 < \infty. \tag{4}$$

Furthermore, $(\log_2(n+1))^2$ *in (4) can not be replaced by* $o\left((\log_2(n+1))^2\right)$*, and there exists an absolute constant* C *such that*

$$\int_\Omega \max_{0\le i\le j<\infty} \|\sum_{n=i}^{j} c_n u_n(\omega)\|^2 \mu(d\omega) \le C \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2. \tag{5}$$

Although its estimation is rough using Cauchy–Schwarz inequality (p251[10]), the Weyl multiplier $\{(\log_2(n+1))^2\}$ is exact: For any Weyl multiplier $\{w(n)\}$ satisfying $w(n) = o((\log_2(n+1))^2)$, there exists an a.e. divergent orthogonal series $\sum_n c_n u_n$, such that $\sum_n w(n)|c_n|^2 < \infty$ (p254[10]). (The main idea is to glue independent pieces of finite orthogonal sequences together, where each piece provides a constant increment on a sufficiently large set, then almost everywhere divergence follows from Borel-Cantelli lemma.)

Moreover, as a remarkable improvement of the above counter-examples, Tandori[23] showed that: for any sequence of positive monotone decreasing numbers $\{c_n\}$ (denoted as $\{c_n\}_+ \downarrow$) satisfying $\sum_n (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 = \infty$, there exists $\{u_n\} \in L^2$ such that $\sum_n c_n u_n$ diverges a.e.. Thus, for any $\{c_n\}_+ \downarrow$, the necessary and sufficient condition for $\sum_n c_n u_n$ to converge almost everywhere for all $\{u_n\} \in L^2$ is (4). Based on Tandori's result and apply Theorem II in [2], we know: if $\{c_n\}_+ \downarrow$ and $\sum_n (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 = \infty$, then $\sum_n c_n u_n$ diverges unboundedly a.e., on a set of orthonormal systems, which is G_δ and everywhere second category subset of $L^2((0,1),\mathbb{R})$, in topology defined in (3).

A recent improvement of Menshov-Rademacher Theorem by A. Lewko and M. Lewko [12] strengthened a.e. finite ∞-variation to a.e. finite 2-variation. They decompose the partial sum process into the sum of two, one of which encodes long range displacement, while the other keeps returning to origin. The power of this decomposition already manifested itself in the proof of Menshov-Rademacher theorem. We will use this decomposition, and show that the partial sum process is a geometric rough process.

For a specific orthonormal system, Weyl multiplier for a.e. convergence can be strengthened, even $w(n) = 1$ for all n. In that case, the orthonormal system is called a convergent system. Among those convergent systems, almost everywhere convergence of L^2 Fourier series came as a deep theorem by Carleson[3]. Hunt[9] extended Carleson's result to L_r, $1 < r < \infty$, and proved:

$$\left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|X(\theta)\|_{\infty-var}^{r} d\theta\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq C_r \left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(\theta)|^r d\theta\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}. \tag{6}$$

where $X(\theta)$ is the partial sum process of Fourier series of f at θ. Moreover, in a recent paper by Oberlin, Seeger, Tao, Chiele and Wright[19], they proved a p-variation version of Carleson's theorem, which is a deep result and mainly the inequality:

$$\left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|X(\theta)\|_{p-var}^{r} d\theta\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq C_{p,r} \left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(\theta)|^r d\theta\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}$$

when $p > \max\{2, r'\}$, with $r' = r/(r-1)$. Thus, the partial sum process of L^2 Fourier series has finite p-variation a.e., for any $p > 2$. As a complement to [19], in [12], the authors proved that $\{\log_2(n+1)\}$ is a Weyl multiplier for a.e. finite 2-variation of Fourier series.

In this paper, we work with general orthonormal systems. Using techniques in rough analysis ([7],[17]), we identify $\left\{(\log_2(n+1))^2\right\}$ as the exact Weyl multiplier for the partial sum process being a geometric 2-rough process. In the case of Fourier series, the condition can be strengthened to $\sum_n \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2 < \infty$, which, as we prove, is equivalent to $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{|f(u)-f(v)|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|} dudv < \infty$ (with $\{c_n\}$ the Fourier coefficients of f). However, as we demonstrate in Example 23, for any Weyl multiplier $\{w(n)\}$ increasing strictly faster than $\left\{(\log_2\log_2 n)^2\right\}$ and satisfying $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{w(n)}{(\log_2\log_2 n)^2} = \infty$, $\sum_n w(n)|c_n|^2 < \infty$ is Not a necessary condition for the partial sum process of Fourier series to be a geometric 2-rough process. Finally, as a complement, we provide a self-contained proof of an example of L^2 Fourier series with infinite 2-variation almost everywhere.

2 Preparations, geometric 2-rough path

Before proceeding to our theorems, we introduce the notion of geometric 2-rough path, following [15] with small modifications. Rough path on $[0,\infty)$ is just a rescaled rough path on $[0,1]$, or more specifically, as defined below.

Notation 7 *Denote* $\triangle_{[0,\infty)} := \{(s,t)\,|0 \leq s \leq t < \infty\}$

We have already defined p-variation of a path on $[0,\infty)$ (Definition 4); the p-variation of functions on $\triangle_{[0,\infty)}$ can be defined in a similar way.

Definition 8 *Suppose* $(\mathcal{V},\|\cdot\|)$ *is a Banach space,* $\alpha:\triangle_{[0,\infty)}\to\mathcal{V}^{\otimes 2}$ *is jointly continuous (with* $\otimes$ *tensor product) satisfying* $\forall t\in[0,\infty)$, $\alpha(t,t)=0$. *For finite interval* I*, denote* $\alpha(I):=\alpha(\inf_{t\in I}t,\sup_{t\in I}t)$. *Then for* $p\in[1,\infty)$*, define the* p*-variation of* α *on* $[0,\infty)$ *as*

$$\|\alpha\|_{p-var,[0,\infty)}:=\lim_{n\to\infty}\|\alpha\|_{p-var,[0,n]}:=\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\sup_{\{I_k\}\in D_{[0,n]}}\sum_k\|\alpha(I_k)\|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $D_{[0,n]}$ *is the set of finite partitions of* $[0,n]$ *as defined in Definition 3.*

We assume $\|u\otimes v\|\leq\|u\|\,\|v\|$, for any u, $v\in\mathcal{V}$. Our proofs are valid as long as there exists constant $C>0$, $\|u\otimes v\|\leq C\|u\|\,\|v\|$ for any u, $v\in\mathcal{V}$. Then if denote 0 and $\mathbf{0}$ as the identity of addition in $\mathcal{V}$ and in $\mathcal{V}^{\otimes 2}$ respectively, we have for any $u\in\mathcal{V}$, $0\otimes u=u\otimes 0=\mathbf{0}$.

Notation 9 *Denote* $[u,v]:=u\otimes v-v\otimes u$.

Definition 10 (2-rough path) *Suppose* $(\mathcal{V},\|\cdot\|)$ *is a Banach space,* $\gamma:[0,\infty)\to\mathcal{V}$ *is continuous,* $\alpha:\triangle_{[0,\infty)}\to\mathcal{V}^{\otimes 2}$ *is jointly continuous and* $\alpha(t,t)=0$ $\forall t\in[0,\infty)$. *Then* $\Gamma:\triangle_{[0,\infty)}\to\mathcal{V}\oplus\mathcal{V}^{\otimes 2}=(\gamma,\alpha)$ *taking value*

$$\Gamma(s,t)=(\gamma(t)-\gamma(s),\alpha(s,t))\quad at\ (s,t)\in\triangle_{[0,\infty)}$$

is a 2*-rough path, if* γ *and* α *satisfy* $\forall\ 0\leq s\leq u\leq t<\infty$,

$$\alpha(s,t)=\alpha(s,u)+\alpha(u,t)+\frac{1}{2}[\gamma(u)-\gamma(s),\gamma(t)-\gamma(u)],\tag{7}$$

$$and\quad\|\Gamma\|_{G^{(2)}}:=\left(\|\gamma\|_{1-var}+\|\alpha\|_{2-var}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}<\infty.\tag{8}$$

The property in (7) is called multiplicativity. Γ satisfying (7) is called multiplicative. The norm $\|\cdot\|_{G^{(2)}}$ defined in (8) is 2-rough path norm.

Suppose Γ is a 2-rough path on $\triangle_{[0,\infty)}$. If define $\gamma(\infty):=\lim_{t\to\infty}\gamma(t)$ and $\alpha(s,\infty):=\lim_{t\to\infty}\alpha(s,t)$, $\forall s\in[0,\infty)$, then these limits exist and finite, and Γ can be continuously extended to be a rough path on $\{(s,t)\,|0\leq s\leq t\leq\infty\}$.

Definition 11 *We say a path is of locally bounded variation if it is of bounded variation on any finite interval. Denote the set of locally bounded variation paths as* BV_{Local}.

Definition 12 *Suppose* $\gamma_i:[0,\infty)\to(\mathcal{V},\|\cdot\|)$, $i=1,2$*, are continuous and of locally bounded variation. Then define the area produced by* γ_1 *and* γ_2 *as function* $A(\gamma_1,\gamma_2):\triangle_{[0,\infty)}\to\mathcal{V}^{\otimes 2}$ *satisfying*

$$A(\gamma_1,\gamma_2)(s,t):=\frac{1}{2}\int_{s<u_1<u_2<t}[d\gamma_1(u_1),d\gamma_2(u_2)],\ \forall(s,t)\in\triangle_{[0,\infty)}.$$

One can check that, for any $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_3 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} A(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)(t_1, t_3) &= A(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)(t_1, t_2) + A(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)(t_2, t_3) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\left[\gamma_1(t_2) - \gamma_1(t_1), \gamma_2(t_3) - \gamma_2(t_2)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Thus, if there exist $c \in \mathcal{V}$ and $i = 1$ or 2, such that $\gamma_i(t_k) = c$ on a sequence of times $0 \leq t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \cdots \leq t_n < \infty$, then using (9) and that for any $u \in \mathcal{V}$, $0 \otimes u = u \otimes 0 = \mathbf{0}$, we get

$$A(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)(t_0, t_n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)(t_k, t_{k+1}). \tag{10}$$

(9) and (10) will be used in our proofs.

Definition 13 *Suppose γ is continuous and of locally bounded variation, then we call $A(\gamma) := A(\gamma, \gamma)$ the area of γ.*

Since $\gamma \in BV_{Local}$, or in our case an integer-interpolated piecewise linear path, it can be checked that $(\gamma, A(\gamma))$ is multiplicative, and of finite 2-rough path norm on any finite interval.

Notation 14 *Suppose X is a process defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ indexed by $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $X(\omega) \in BV_{Local}$ a.e.. Denote $A(X)$ as the area process of X, defined as $(A(X))(\omega) = A(X(\omega))$ when $X(\omega) \in BV_{Local}$ and $(A(X))(\omega) = \mathbf{0}$ elsewhere.*

Definition 15 (geometric 2-rough path) *Suppose $(\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space. $\Gamma : \triangle_{[0,\infty)} \to \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{V}^{\otimes 2} = (\gamma, \alpha)$ is called a geometric 2-rough path, if Γ is a 2-rough path, and there exists a sequence of continuous bounded variation paths $\gamma_n : [0, \infty) \to \mathcal{V}$, $n \geq 1$, such that*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|\Gamma - (\gamma_n, A(\gamma_n))\|_{G^{(2)}} = 0.$$

Definition 16 (2-rough process) *Suppose $(\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space. $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is a process defined on measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$, with state space $\mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{V}^{\otimes 2}$, and indexed by $\triangle_{[0,\infty)}$. Then we say $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is a (geometric) 2-rough process, if $\mathbf{\Gamma}(\omega)$ is a (geometric) 2-rough path for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.*

Suppose X is a process defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$, with state space $\mathcal{V}$, indexed by $[0, \infty)$. If for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists $A(\omega) : \triangle_{[0,\infty)} \to \mathcal{V}^{\otimes 2}$, such that $(X(\omega), A(\omega))$ is a (geometric) 2-rough path, then we say X can be enhanced to be a (geometric) 2-rough process, or simply X is a (geometric) 2-rough process when A is proven to exist.

The entry of area in the definition of rough path is very natural. Suppose $\gamma : [0, T] \to \mathcal{V}$ is a path of finite p-variation. Consider the following example:

$$d\beta_\gamma(t) = [\gamma(t) - \gamma(0), d\gamma(t)], \ \ \beta_\gamma(0) = \xi. \tag{11}$$

According to Young's integral [27], when $1 \leq p < 2$, the Riemann integral $\beta_\gamma(t) = \int_{0<u_1<u_2<t} [d\gamma(u_1), d\gamma(u_2)] + \xi$ exists and

$$\left\|\beta_{\gamma_1} - \beta_{\gamma_2}\right\|_{p-var,[0,T]} \\ \leq C_p \left(\|\gamma_1\|_{p-var,[0,T]} + \|\gamma_2\|_{p-var,[0,T]}\right) \|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_{p-var,[0,T]},$$

i.e. the solution β_γ in (11) is continuous in p-variation topology w.r.t. the driving noise γ. However, this is no longer true when $p \geq 2$. The following sequence of smooth functions defined on $[0,1]$

$$f_n(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2^k} \exp\left\{2\pi i \frac{2^{2k}}{k} \theta\right\} \tag{12}$$

converges in 2-variation norm as $n \to \infty$, but their area on $[0,1]$ tends to infinity as $n \to \infty$. Thus it makes sense to couple the path with its area, and treat them as one object, which we call a rough path. By proving a finite 2-variation path γ can be enhanced to be a geometric 2-rough path, rough path theory gives meaning to differential equations driven by enhanced γ, and the solution of differential equations driven by enhanced γ can be approximated in rough path norm by solutions driven by a sequence of bounded variation paths. However, such lift does not always exists, see [24]. (For more general and systematical treatments of rough path, please refer to [15], [16] and [5].)

3 Main Result

Suppose $\{u_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is an orthonormal system in L^2 (i.e. $\{u_n\} \in L^2$), and $\{c_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a sequence of numbers. We use logarithm to base 2 for simpler constants.

$\|\cdot\|_{G^{(2)}}$ is the 2-rough path norm defined at (8).

Theorem 17 *The partial sum process of* $\sum_n c_n u_n$*, when enhanced by its area process(Notation 14), is a geometric 2-rough process (denoted as* $\mathbf{X}$*) for any* $\{u_n\} \in L^2$ *and any* $\{c_n\}$ *satisfying* $\sum_{n=0}^\infty (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 < \infty$*. Moreover,* $(\log_2(n+1))^2$ *can not be replaced by* $o((\log_2(n+1))^2)$*, and*

$$\int_\Omega \|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|_{G^{(2)}}^2 \mu(d\omega) \leq 768 \sum_{n=0}^\infty (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2. \tag{13}$$

This theorem is an improvement of Menshov-Rademacher Theorem since $\|X(\omega)\|_{\infty-var} \leq \|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|_{G^{(2)}}, \forall\omega$. The constant 768 is a crude estimation and can be improved for sure.

Definition 18 $\{u_n\}$ *is said to have the Hardy property with constant* C*, if for any sequence of numbers* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *satisfying* $\sum_{n=0}^\infty |a_n|^2 < \infty$*,*

$$\int_\Omega \sup_{0\leq i\leq j<\infty} \left\|\sum_{k=i}^{j} a_k u_k(\omega)\right\|^2 \mu(d\omega) \leq C\left(\sum_{n=0}^\infty |a_n|^2\right).$$

Theorem 19 *Suppose* $\{u_n\}$ *has the Hardy property with constant* C*. Then, for* $\{c_n\}$ *satisfying* $\sum_n \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2 < \infty$*, the partial sum process of* $\sum_n c_n u_n$*, when enhanced by its area process, is a geometric* 2*-rough process (denoted as* $\mathbf{X}$*). Moreover,*

$$\int_\Omega \|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|^2_{G^{(2)}} \mu(d\omega) \le (3580 + 40C) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2 . \tag{14}$$

Corollary 20 *Theorem 19 holds for Fourier system, where* $\log_2(n+1)$ *in (14) can not be replaced by* $o(\log_2(n+1))$*.*

This corollary follows from Carleson–Hunt's inequality (6) (see also [4]) and Theorem 19. The lower bound, as indicated in [19] or [12], can be obtained in the case of de la Vallée-Poussin kernel, or say, Dirichlet kernel.

It is reasonable to define sobolev space H^s_{Log} for $s > 0$, as the space of functions in $L^2([-\pi,\pi], \mathbb{R}^d)$, whose Fourier coefficients satisfy

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^{2s} |c_n|^2 < \infty.$$

Then we have the following identification of functions in H^s_{Log}.

Theorem 21 *For any* $s \in (0,\infty)$*, there exist constants* $0 < k_s \le K_s < \infty$*, such that for any* $f \in L^2([-\pi,\pi], \mathbb{R}^d)$*,* $d \ge 1$*, with Fourier coefficients* $\{c_n\}$*,*

$$\text{if denote } L := \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{|f(u)-f(v)|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|} (\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|})^{2s-1} du dv$$

$$\text{and } l := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^{2s} |c_n|^2 \text{, then } k_s l \le L \le K_s l.$$

Corollary 22 *Suppose* $f : [-\pi,\pi] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ *satisfying*

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{|f(u)-f(v)|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|} du dv < \infty.$$

Then f *is in* L^2*, and the partial sum process of the Fourier series of* f*, when enhanced by its area process, is a geometric* 2*-rough process (denoted as* $\mathbf{X}$*). Moreover,*

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\mathbf{X}(\theta)\|^2_{G^{(2)}} d\theta \le (3580 + 40C_0) k_{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{|f(u)-f(v)|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|} du dv,$$

where C_0 *is the Hardy constant for* L^2 *Fourier series and* $k_{\frac{1}{2}}$ *is defined in Theorem 21.*

This corollary follows trivially from Corollary 20 and Theorem 21.

Function $x^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left|\log_2\frac{x}{2}\right|^{-\left(s+\frac{1}{2}\right)}\left|\log_2\left(2\left|\log_2\frac{x}{2}\right|\right)\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}$, $x\in(0,1)$, (according to Theorem 2.24 p190 Vol I [29]) is included in H^s_{Log} when $\epsilon>0$, while not included in H^s_{Log} when $\epsilon\leq 0$.

However, although for Fourier series, $\log_2(n+1)$ in Corollary 20 can not be replaced by $o(\log_2(n+1))$, $\sum_n \log_2(n+1)\left|c_n\right|^2<\infty$ is not a necessary condition for the partial sum process of Fourier series to be a geometric 2-rough process. In fact, we give a little stronger statement.

Example 23 *Suppose* $\{w(n)\}$ *is a Weyl multiplier that* $n\mapsto\frac{w(n)}{(\log_2\log_2 n)^2}$ *is strictly increasing from some point on, and* $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{w(n)}{(\log_2\log_2 n)^2}=\infty$. *Then there exists a* 2*-dimensional Fourier series* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}c_n e^{in\theta}$*, such that the partial sum process of which is a geometric* 2*-rough process, but* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}w(n)\left|c_n\right|^2=\infty$.

One might be tempted to ask whether all L^2 Fourier series have finite 2-variation a.e., which, however, is not true. It is proved in [6] that there exists a bounded function, such that the partial sum process of its Fourier series has infinite 2-variation a.e.. In [12], they generalized the result in [6] to all complete orthonormal systems. Both results rely on nontrivial estimates on 2-variation of partial sum process of i.i.d. sequences, i.e.[21] and [13]. In this paper, we provide a self-contained proof, where we use the upper semi-continuity of cumulative distribution function of p-variation. This example is constructed without knowledge of [6] or [12], nor the results in [21] or [13].

Example 24 *There exists an* L^2 *Fourier series with infinite* 2*-variation almost everywhere.*

4 Proof of Theorem 17 and Theorem 19

In our proofs, we assume that $\{u_n\}$ is an orthonormal system in L^2, and $\{c_n\}$ is a sequence of numbers.

Notation 25 *Denote the set of integers* $\mathbb{N}:=\{0,1,2,\dots\}$.

Definition 26 *Interval* I *is said to be an integer interval, if* $I=[m,n]$ *for* $m\in\mathbb{N}$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $m<n$.

If two intervals only intersect on their boundary, then we abuse the notion and label them as "*disjoint*".

Since the process we are considering is piecewise linear obtained by interpolating on integers, we assume that all intervals in finite partitions are integer intervals, without decreasing the 2-variation of the path, or 1-variation of the area (proved in the appendix).

Since we do analysis for finite partitions formed by integer intervals, in the rest of this section, unless otherwise specified, "I is an interval" means "I is an integer interval".

Definition 27 *Interval I is called a dyadic interval of level $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $I = [k2^n, (k+1)\,2^n]$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Integer m is called a dyadic point of level $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $m = k2^n$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Notation 28 *For interval J, denote the level of biggest dyadic interval in J as $n\,(J)$, i.e. $n\,(J) = \max\{\text{level of dyadic interval } I | I \subseteq J\}$. Similarly, for $P \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $N\,(P) := \max\{n | P = k2^n \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N},\, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$.*

Thus, $2^{n(J)} \leq |J|$, so $n\,(J) \leq \log_2 |J|$; $N\,(0) = \infty$; $N\,(m) \geq 0$, $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Notation 29 *Suppose J is a finite interval. Denote the set of dyadic intervals which can be fit into J as B_J, i.e. $B_J := \{I|\ \text{interval } I \text{ is dyadic, and } I \subseteq J\}$. Denote B_J^j as the set of level j dyadic intervals included in J, i.e. $B_J^j := \{I | I \in B_J,\, n\,(I) = j\}$.*

Then two properties of $B_J(B_J^j)$.

(i) Suppose $\{I_k\} \in D_J$ (i.e.$\{I_k\}$ is a finite partition of interval J), then $B_{I_{k_1}} \cap B_{I_{k_2}} = \varnothing$ when $k_1 \neq k_2$, and

$$\sqcup_k B_{I_k} \subseteq B_J. \tag{15}$$

Similar result holds for B_J^j for any level j:

$$\sqcup_k B_{I_k}^j \subseteq B_J^j. \tag{16}$$

Proof. Only prove (15); (16) is similar. $I_k \subseteq J$ so $B_{I_k} \subseteq B_J$. I_{k_1} and I_{k_2} are disjoint when $k_1 \neq k_2$, so $B_{I_{k_1}} \cap B_{I_{k_2}} = \varnothing$. ■

(ii) Let X be the partial sum process of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n u_n$. Then for any interval J,

$$\sum_{I \in B_J} \int_\Omega \|X_\omega\,(I)\|^2\,\mu\,(d\omega) \leq 2\log_2(|J|+1) \sum_{k,[k-1,k]\subseteq J} |c_k|^2. \tag{17}$$

Proof. Since each $[k-1,k] \subseteq J$ can only be included in one dyadic interval of level j, $0 \leq j \leq n\,(J)$, so in $\cup_I \{I | I \in B_J\}$ (the union of all dyadic intervals in J), $[k-1,k]$ is counted at most $n\,(J) + 1 \leq \log_2 |J| + 1 \leq 2\log_2(|J|+1)$ times. While for any interval I,

$$\int_\Omega \|X_\omega\,(I)\|^2\,\mu\,(d\omega) = \int_\Omega \|\sum_{k,[k-1,k]\subseteq I} c_k u_k\,(\omega)\,\|^2 \mu\,(d\omega) = \sum_{k,[k-1,k]\subseteq I} |c_k|^2,$$

so sum over all dyadic intervals I in B_J,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{I \in B_J} \int_\Omega \|X_\omega\,(I)\|^2\,\mu\,(d\omega) &= \sum_{I \in B_J} \sum_{k,[k-1,k]\subseteq I} |c_k|^2 \\
&= \sum_{k,[k-1,k]\subseteq J} \#\{I|\,[k-1,k] \subseteq I, I \in B_J\}\,|c_k|^2 \\
&\leq 2\log_2(|J|+1) \sum_{k,[k-1,k]\subseteq J} |c_k|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

■

The following two Lemmas give a method of decomposing an interval as union of dyadic intervals.

Lemma 30 *Suppose J is an interval with one boundary point a level n dyadic point $k2^n$, for some $k \geq 0$, $n \geq 1$, and $|J| < 2^n$. Then, J can be decomposed as union of disjoint dyadic intervals, in such a way that the level of dyadic intervals is strictly monotone with respect to their position in J (strictly increasing when $k2^n$ is the right boundary point of J; strictly decreasing when $k2^n$ is the left boundary point of J).*

Proof. Suppose $k2^n$ is the right boundary point of J (result for left boundary point can be obtained by symmetry). Translate J by $-(k-1)\,2^n$ (translating J, $|J| < 2^n$, by $j2^n$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, will not affect our conclusion) and assume $J = [m, 2^n]$ for some $m \geq 1$. We use mathematical induction on n. As a clear consequence of $|J| < 2^n$, any dyadic interval in J is of level strictly less than n.

When $n = 1$, since $|J| < 2^n$, so $|J| = 1$. Thus J itself is a 0 level interval.

Suppose the result is true for $n = l$, i.e. for any $1 \leq m < 2^l$, $\left[m, 2^l\right]$ can be decomposed as union of dyadic intervals such that their level is strictly increasing with respect to their position in $\left[m, 2^l\right]$. Then we will prove that the same statement holds when $n = l + 1$. Suppose $J = \left[m, 2^{l+1}\right]$ for some $1 \leq m < 2^{l+1}$. If $m < 2^l$, then according to inductive hypothesis, there exists a dyadic partition of $\left[m, 2^l\right] = \cup_k I_k$, such that the level of I_k is strictly increasing. In that case, decompose $\left[m, 2^{l+1}\right] = \cup_k I_k \cup \left[2^l, 2^{l+1}\right]$. Since each I_k has level strictly less than l, $\cup_k I_k \cup \left[2^l, 2^{l+1}\right]$ is still strictly increasing in their level. If $m = 2^l$, then J is itself a dyadic interval $\left[2^l, 2^{l+1}\right]$. If $m > 2^l$, then by translation, use inductive hypothesis on $\left[m - 2^l, 2^l\right]$, proof finishes. ■

Lemma 31 *Suppose J is an interval, then there exists a decomposition of J as union of disjoint dyadic intervals, in a way that there exists a point P in the dyadic partition, such that $N(P) \geq n(J) + 1$, and to the left and right side of P, the level of dyadic intervals is strictly decreasing. As a result, no more than two dyadic intervals of any given level are included, and the number of dyadic intervals is bounded by $4\log_2(|J| + 1)$.*

Proof. Denote $n_0 := n(J)$ (the level of biggest dyadic interval in J). Then there exists at least one dyadic interval of level n_0 in J, and there can be two adjacent ones, but there can not be more than two of them. If there are two n_0 intervals, then they are adjacent, because the gap between n_0 intervals is a union of n_0 intervals, so if there were gap between them, there would be at least three consecutive n_0 intervals in J (because J is an interval, all intermediate intervals are also in J), thus two of them will constitute a level $n_0 + 1$ interval, contradicting with maximal assumption for n_0. (Suppose the three consecutive n_0 intervals are $[j2^{n_0}, (j+1)\,2^{n_0}]$, $j = k, k+1, k+2$. Then if k is even, the first two constitute a $n_0 + 1$ interval $[k2^{n_0}, (k+2)\,2^{n_0}]$; if k is odd, the last two constitute a $n_0 + 1$ interval $[(k+1)\,2^{n_0}, (k+3)\,2^{n_0}]$.) Same reasoning applies that one can verify that there are no more than two n_0 intervals in J. In this way, we decompose J as union of three intervals: the interval to the left of n_0 interval(s), denoted as I_l; n_0 interval(s); the interval to the right of n_0 interval(s), denoted as I_r.

We take I_l as example. Suppose I_l is not empty. According to the construction of I_l, it is an interval with right boundary point a n_0 level dyadic point, and $|I_l| < 2^{n_0}$ (otherwise I_l contains an n_0 interval—since it shares a n_0 level dyadic point with the n_0 interval(s)—contradicting with the construction of I_l). Thus according to Lemma 30, I_l can be decomposed as union of dyadic intervals, whose level are less than n_0, and strictly increasing with respect to their position in I_l. Same reasoning applies to I_r, i.e. I_r can be decomposed as union of dyadic intervals of strictly decreasing level, with highest level less than n_0. Then we select P as one of the boundary points of n_0 interval(s). If there are two n_0 intervals, then select P as the point which parts them. The reason that these two n_0 intervals do not constitute an n_0+1 interval is that the point parting them is a dyadic point of level n_0+1, so $N(P) \geq n(J)+1$. ($[k2^{n_0},(k+2)\,2^{n_0}]$ is not a level n_0+1 dyadic interval iff k is odd, so $2^{n_0+1}|\,(k+1)\,2^{n_0}$, $(k+1)\,2^{n_0}$ is a dyadic point of level n_0+1.) Otherwise there is only one n_0 interval, denoted as $[k2^{n_0},(k+1)\,2^{n_0}]$ (there are no more than two n_0 intervals, as we verified). If k is even, let $P = k2^{n_0}$; if k is odd, let $P = (k+1)\,2^{n_0}$. Then $2^{n_0+1}|P$, $N(P) \geq n(J)+1$. In this way, J is decomposed as disjoint union of dyadic intervals, s.t. there exists point $P \in J$ satisfying $N(P) \geq n(J)+1$, and the level of dyadic intervals is strictly decreasing from P to left and right. As a result, no more than two dyadic intervals of any given level are included.

Since $2^{n_0} \leq |J|$, so $n_0 \leq \log_2 |J|$. In our decomposition there are no more than two dyadic intervals of any given level, with highest level n_0, thus the number of dyadic intervals is bounded by $2n_0+2 \leq 2\log_2|J|+2 \leq 4\log_2(|J|+1)$. ■

Remark 32 *Since the level of dyadic intervals to the left/right of P is strictly decreasing and $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^k = 2^n - 1$ (thus one can not get new dyadic interval through union), one can check that, the decomposition will be the same, if one repeatedly cut out the biggest dyadic interval available in J.*

Definition 33 *Suppose $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to (\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ is continuous, and $\{t_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of strictly increasing positive real numbers satisfying $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = \infty$. Then we say γ^1 is the path which coincides with γ on $\{t_n\}$ and linear in between and denote $\gamma^1 = L(\gamma, \{t_n\})$, if $\gamma^1(t) = \gamma(t_0)$ on $t \in [0,t_0]$, and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\gamma^1(t) = \frac{\gamma(t_{n+1}) - \gamma(t_n)}{t_{n+1}-t_n} t + \frac{t_{n+1}\gamma(t_n) - t_n\gamma(t_{n+1})}{t_{n+1}-t_n}, t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}].$$

Suppose X is a process defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ taking value in $(\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$, and indexed by $[0,\infty)$. Then we say X^1 is the process which coincides with X on $\{t_n\}$ and linear in between, and denoted as $X^1 = L(X, \{t_n\})$, if for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $X^1(\omega) = L(X(\omega), \{t_n\})$.

Lemma 34 *Suppose* $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to (\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ *is a continuous path, and* $\{t_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *is a sequence of strictly increasing positive numbers satisfying* $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = \infty$. *Let* $\gamma^1 = L(\gamma, \{t_n\})$, *then*

$$\|\gamma\|_{2-var}^2 \leq 3\left(\|\gamma\|_{2-var,[0,t_0]}^2 + \left\|\gamma^1\right\|_{2-var}^2 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|\gamma\|_{2-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]}^2\right),$$

Proof. For any finite interval $[s,t] \subset [0,\infty)$, if there exists $k \leq l$, s.t. $s < t_k \leq t_l < t$. Then

$$\|\gamma(s,t)\|^2 \leq 3\left(\|\gamma(s,t_k)\|^2 + \|\gamma(t_k,t_l)\|^2 + \|\gamma(t_l,t)\|^2\right). \tag{18}$$

In this way, we cut out those long intervals $[t_l,t_k]$ which contents no partition points, and divide $[s,t]$ which contents one t_k into two. Therefore, for any fixed finite partition $\{[s_k,s_{k+1}]\}_k \in D_{[0,t_N]}$, apply (18) to each $[s_k,s_{k+1}]$, sum over k,

$$\sum_k \|\gamma(s_k,s_{k+1})\|^2 \leq 3\left(\|\gamma\|_{2-var,[0,t_0]}^2 + \left\|\gamma^1\right\|_{2-var,[0,t_N]}^2 + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\gamma\|_{2-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]}^2\right).$$

Take supremum over all possible finite partitions of $[0,t_N]$, and let N tends to infinity. ■

Lemma 35 *Suppose* $\gamma, \gamma^2 : [0,\infty) \to (\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ *are of locally bounded variation, and there exist* $c \in \mathcal{V}$ *and a sequence of positive strictly increasing numbers* $\{t_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *satisfying* $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = \infty$, *such that* $\gamma^2(t_n) = c$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. *Then if denote* $\gamma^1 := \gamma - \gamma^2$, *we have (denote* $A := A(\gamma)$, $A^{11} := A(\gamma^1)$*),*

$$\begin{aligned}\|A\|_{1-var} &\leq \|A\|_{1-var,[0,t_0]} + 2\|\gamma\|_{2-var}^2 \\ &\quad +2\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|A\|_{1-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]} + 2\sup_{\{n_k\}} \sum_{n_k<n_{k+1}} \left\|A^{11}(t_{n_k},t_{n_{k+1}})\right\|.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We estimate $\|A\|_{1-var,[0,t_N]}$, $N \geq 1$, by inserting partition points $\{t_n\}_{n=0}^{N}$ into any finite partition of $[0,t_N]$. Fix $\{[s_k,s_{k+1}]\} \in D_{[0,t_N]}$. If there exist integers n_1, n_2, such that $s_k < t_{n_1} \leq t_{n_2} < s_{k+1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\|A(s_k,s_{k+1})\| \\ \leq\ &\|A(s_k,t_{n_1})\| + \|A(t_{n_1},t_{n_2})\| + \|A(t_{n_2},s_{k+1})\| \\ &\quad +2\|\gamma(s_k,t_{n_1})\|^2 + 2\|\gamma(t_{n_1},t_{n_2})\|^2 + 2\|\gamma(t_{n_2},s_{k+1})\|^2 \\ \leq\ &\|A(s_k,t_{n_1})\| + \|A(t_{n_1},t_{n_2})\| + \|A(t_{n_2},s_{k+1})\| + 2\|\gamma\|_{2-var,[s_k,s_{k+1}]}^2.\end{aligned}$$

In this way, we cut out those big intervals $[t_{n_1},t_{n_2}]$, $n_1 < n_2$, which have no partition points, and divide $[s_k,s_{k+1}]$ which contains one t_n into $[s_k,t_n] \cup [t_n,s_{k+1}]$. Therefore, apart from intervals in the form $[t_{n_1},t_{n_2}]$, we have three kinds of intervals: $[s_k, t_{n_1}]$, $[s_k, s_{k+1}]$ and $[t_{n_2}, s_{k+1}]$, each of which is included in some $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\|A\|_{1-var,[0,t_N]} &\leq \|A\|_{1-var,[0,t_0]} + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|A\|_{1-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]} + 2\|\gamma\|_{2-var,[0,t_N]}^2 \\ &\quad + \sup_{\{n_k\}, n_k \leq N} \sum_{n_k < n_{k+1}} \left\|A\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\|.\end{aligned}$$

Take limit $N \to \infty$ on both sides, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|A\|_{1-var} &\leq \|A\|_{1-var,[0,t_0]} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|A\|_{1-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]} + 2\|\gamma\|_{2-var}^2 \\ &\quad + \sup_{\{n_k\}} \sum_{n_k < n_{k+1}} \left\|A\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\|.\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Denote $A^{11,c} := A - A^{11}$, so $\left\|A\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\| \leq \left\|A^{11,c}\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\| + \left\|A^{11}\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\|$. Since $\gamma^2(t_n) = c$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, we know (identity (10) at p6),

$$\left\|A^{11,c}\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\| \leq \sum_{k=n_k}^{n_{k+1}-1} \left\|A^{11,c}\left(t_k, t_{k+1}\right)\right\|,$$

$$\text{so } \sup_{\{n_k\}} \sum_{n_k < n_{k+1}} \left\|A^{11,c}\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\|A^{11,c}\left(t_n, t_{n+1}\right)\right\|.$$

Use $\left\|A^{11,c}(t_n, t_{n+1})\right\| \leq \|A(t_n, t_{n+1})\| + \left\|A^{11}(t_n, t_{n+1})\right\|$, we get

$$\sup_{\{n_k\}} \sum_{n_k < n_{k+1}} \left\|A^{11,c}\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|A(t_n, t_{n+1})\| + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\|A^{11}(t_n, t_{n+1})\right\|.$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{Thus, } \sup_{\{n_k\}} \sum_{n_k < n_{k+1}} \left\|A\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\| \\ \leq\ & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|A(t_n, t_{n+1})\| + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\|A^{11}(t_n, t_{n+1})\right\| + \sup_{\{n_k\}} \sum_{n_k < n_{k+1}} \left\|A^{11}\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\| \\ \leq\ & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|A\|_{1-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]} + 2 \sup_{\{n_k\}} \sum_{n_k < n_{k+1}} \left\|A^{11}\left(t_{n_k}, t_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right\|.\end{aligned}$$

Combined with (19), proof finishes. ■

Corollary 36 *Suppose X is a process defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ taking value in $(\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$, and indexed by $[0, \infty)$. Further assume that $X_\omega \in BV_{Local}$ a.e. with $A := A(X)$, and $X^1 = L(X, \{t_n\})$ (Definition 33) with $A^{11} := A\left(X^1\right)$. Then if $\left(X^1, A^{11}\right)$ is a 2-rough process, (X, A) is a geometric 2-rough process provided*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\|X_\omega\|_{2-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]}^2 + \|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]}\right) < \infty, \text{ a.e.}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega}\|X_{\omega}\|_{2-var}^{2}\mu(d\omega) &\leq 3\int_{\Omega}\|X_{\omega}\|_{2-var,[0,t_0]}^{2}\mu(d\omega) \qquad (20)\\ &+3\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\int_{\Omega}\|X_{\omega}\|_{2-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]}^{2}\mu(d\omega)+3\int_{\Omega}\left\|X_{\omega}^{1}\right\|_{2-var}^{2}\mu(d\omega),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega}\|A_{\omega}\|_{1-var}\mu(d\omega) &\leq \int_{\Omega}\|A_{\omega}\|_{1-var,[0,t_0]}\mu(d\omega)+2\int_{\Omega}\|X_{\omega}\|_{2-var}^{2}\mu(d\omega) \qquad (21)\\ &+2\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\int_{\Omega}\|A_{\omega}\|_{1-var,[t_n,t_{n+1}]}\mu(d\omega)+2\int_{\Omega}\left\|A_{\omega}^{11}\right\|_{1-var}\mu(d\omega).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since X_ω is of locally bounded variation a.e., thus if (X,A) is a 2-rough process, (X,A) is a geometric 2-rough process. $X^1 = L(X,\{t_n\})$, so for each $\omega\in\Omega$, $\left(X_\omega - X_\omega^1\right)(t_n) = 0$, $\forall n\in\mathbb{N}$, and the rest of this corollary follows trivially from Lemma 34 and Lemma 35. ■

The following Lemma works in the same spirit as the Lemma used in the proof of Menshov-Rademacher theorem, but replace ∞-variation by 2-variation.

Lemma 37 *Suppose X is the partial sum process of $\sum_{k=0}^{n} c_n u_n$, then,*

$$\int_{\Omega}\|X_{\omega}\|_{2-var,[0,n]}^{2}\mu(d\omega)\leq 8\left(\log_2(n+1)\right)^2\sum_{k=1}^{n}|c_k|^2.$$

Proof. Suppose interval $J\subseteq[0,n]$. By Lemma 31, decompose J as union of disjoint dyadic intervals, denote them as I_k, $1\leq k\leq l$, with $l\leq 4\log_2(|J|+1)$. B_J is the set of dyadic intervals included in J (Notation 29). I_k are disjoint as k varies since $\{I_k\}$ is a finite partition of J, and each I_k is a member of B_J, so $\sum_{k=1}^{l}\|X_\omega(I_k)\|^2\leq\sum_{I\in B_J}\|X_\omega(I)\|^2$ for each $\omega\in\Omega$. Then using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|X_{\omega}(J)\|^{2} &= \|\sum_{k=1}^{l}X_{\omega}(I_k)\|^{2}\leq l\sum_{k=1}^{l}\|X_{\omega}(I_k)\|^{2} \qquad (22)\\ &\leq 4\log_2(|J|+1)\sum_{k=1}^{l}\|X_{\omega}(I_k)\|^{2}\leq 4\log_2(n+1)\sum_{I\in B_J}\|X_{\omega}(I)\|^{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\{I_j\}\in D_{[0,n]}$ (the set of finite partitions of $[0,n]$). Use (22) for each I_j, and $\sqcup_j B_{I_j}\subseteq B_{[0,n]}$ (according to (15)),

$$\|X_{\omega}\|_{2-var,[0,n]}^{2}=\sup_{\{I_j\}\in D_{[0,n]}}\sum_{j}\|X_{\omega}(I_j)\|^{2}\leq 4\log_2(n+1)\sum_{I\in B_{[0,n]}}\|X_{\omega}(I)\|^{2}.$$

Integrate both sides, and use property at (17), i.e. $\sum_{I\in B_{[0,n]}}\int_\Omega \|X_\omega(I)\|^2\mu(d\omega)\le 2\log_2(n+1)\sum_{k=1}^n|c_k|^2$, we get

$$\int_\Omega \|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var,[0,n]}\mu(d\omega)\le 8(\log_2(n+1))^2\sum_{k=1}^n|c_k|^2.$$

■

This inequality is interesting when taking into account that: (p255[10]) there exists $c_0>0$ such that, for any $n\ge 1$ there exists an orthonormal sequence $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^n$ on $(0,1)$, s.t. the partial sum process X^n of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^n\varphi_k$ satisfies

$$P\left(\|X^n\|_{\infty-var}\ge c_0\log_2 n\right)\ge\frac{1}{4}.$$

The following result is proved in [12], we put it here for completeness.

Lemma 38 *The partial sum process of* $\sum_n c_nu_n$ *(denoted as* X*) is of finite* 2*-variation a.e. for any orthonormal system* $\{u_n\}$ *in* L^2 *and any sequence of numbers* $\{c_n\}$ *satisfying* $\sum_n(\log_2(n+1))^2|c_n|^2<\infty$*. Moreover,* $(\log_2(n+1))^2$ *can not be replaced by* $o\left((\log_2(n+1))^2\right)$ *and*

$$\int_\Omega\|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var}\mu(d\omega)\le 36\sum_{n=0}^\infty(\log_2(n+1))^2|c_n|^2. \tag{23}$$

Proof. Since $\|X_\omega\|_{\infty-var}\le\|X_\omega\|_{2-var}$, $\forall\omega\in\Omega$, so based on Menshov-Rademacher Theorem (Theorem 6), we only have to prove (23). Define process $X^1:=L(X,\{2^n\})$ (Definition 33), then according to (20) in Corollary 36,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega\|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var}\mu(d\omega) &\le 3\int_\Omega\|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var,[0,1]}\mu(d\omega)\\ &+3\sum_{n=0}^\infty\int_\Omega\|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]}\mu(d\omega)+3\int_\Omega\left\|X^1_\omega\right\|^2_{2-var}\mu(d\omega).\end{aligned}$$

While if denote f as the limit function (according to Menshov-Rademacher theorem, $f(\omega)=\lim_{n\to\infty}X_\omega(n)$ exists a.e., set $f(\omega)=0$ elsewhere), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega\left\|X^1_\omega\right\|^2_{2-var}\mu(d\omega) &= \int_\Omega\sup_{\{m_k\}}\sum_k\|X_\omega(2^{m_{k+1}})-X_\omega(2^{m_k})\|^2\mu(d\omega)\\ &\le 2\int_\Omega\sum_{n=0}^\infty\|X_\omega(2^n)-f(\omega)\|^2\mu(d\omega)=2\sum_{n=0}^\infty\sum_{k\ge 2^n+1}|c_k|^2\\ &\le 4\sum_{n=2}^\infty(\log_2(n+1))^2|c_n|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, we used that, when $n\ge 2$, $\log_2 2(n-1)\le 2\log_2 n\le 2(\log_2(n+1))^2$. Since $\int_\Omega\|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var,[0,1]}\mu(d\omega)\le|c_1|^2$, combined with Lemma

37 for estimation of $\|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]}$, $n \geq 0$, proof finishes($3\times 8+3\times 4=36$).
■

We will use this lemma in the proof of Theorem 17.

Proof of Theorem 17. Denote the partial sum process of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n u_n$ as X, and $A := A(X)$ as the area process of X (Notation 14). Since $\|X_\omega\|_{\infty-var} \leq \|X_\omega\|_{2-var}$, $\forall \omega \in \Omega$, so based on Menshov-Rademacher Theorem(in p3), we only need to prove $\int_\Omega \|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var} + \|A_\omega\|_{1-var}\, \mu(d\omega) \leq 768 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2$. While $\int_\Omega \|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var}\, \mu(d\omega)$ is done in Lemma 38, so we concentrate on 1-variation of area. Denote $X^1 := L(X, \{2^n\})$ (Definition 33) and $A^{11} := A(X^1)$, then use (21) in Corollary 36:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \|A_\omega\|_{1-var}\,\mu(d\omega) \quad \leq \quad & 2\int_\Omega \|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var}\,\mu(d\omega) + \int_\Omega \|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[0,1]}\,\mu(d\omega) \\ & +2\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\int_\Omega \|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[2^l,2^{l+1}]}\,\mu(d\omega) + 2\int_\Omega \left\|A^{11}_\omega\right\|_{1-var}\mu(d\omega).\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Since X_ω is linear on $[0,1]$ and $[1,2]$, so $\|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[0,1]} = \|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[1,2]} = 0$, $\forall \omega \in \Omega$. Thus, we are done if we can prove

$$\int_\Omega \|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[2^l,2^{l+1}]}\,\mu(d\omega) \leq 10 \sum_{n=2^l+1}^{2^{l+1}} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2, \ \forall l \geq 1 \tag{25}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \left\|A^{11}_\omega\right\|_{1-var}\mu(d\omega) \leq 32\pi^2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2. \tag{26}$$

($\pi^2 \leq 10$, $2\times 36 + 2\times 10 + 2\times 32\pi^2 \leq 732$, $732+36=768$.)

In the following, we do analysis for fixed $\omega \in \Omega$.

Using multiplicativity of (X_ω, A_ω) (identity (7) at p5), for any finite interval I and any disjoint decomposition $\{I_1, I_2\} \in D_I$, we have

$$\|A_\omega(I)\| \leq \|A_\omega(I_1)\| + \|A_\omega(I_2)\| + \|X_\omega(I_1)\|\,\|X_\omega(I_2)\|.$$

Therefore, for A_ω on dyadic interval $I = \left[m2^n, (m+1)2^{n+1}\right]$, repeatedly bisecting I down to 0 level dyadic intervals on which X_ω is linear and the area vanishes, we get (B_I is the set of dyadic intervals included in I, Notation 29),

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_\omega(I)\| &= \left\|A_\omega\left(m2^n, (m+1)2^{n+1}\right)\right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\sum_{k=0}^{2^{n-j}-1} \left\|X_\omega\left(\left[m2^n + k2^j, m2^n + (k+1)2^j\right]\right)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{I' \in B_I \setminus \{I\}} \|X_\omega(I')\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

$I' \in B_I \backslash \{I\}$ is because we sum over level j dyadic intervals in I, $0 \leq j \leq n-1$, while I is a level n dyadic interval, so I itself is not included in the summation. This estimation of A_ω on dyadic interval will be used repeatedly.

For interval J which is not dyadic, decomposing it as union of dyadic intervals $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{l}$ by Lemma 31, then $l \leq 4\log_2(|J|+1)$. We estimate $A_\omega(J)$ by successively removing points from the dyadic partition from the right to left according to their position in J. Suppose $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{l}$ is arranged in an increasing order according to their position in J, then the accumulated error incurred to $\|A_\omega(J)\|$ from removing point between I_k and $\cup_{j=k+1}^{l} I_j$, $1 \leq k \leq l-1$, is bounded by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \|X_\omega(I_k)\| \left\|X_\omega\left(\cup_{j=k+1}^{l} I_j\right)\right\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} (l-k) \|X_\omega(I_k)\|^2 \tag{28}$$

$$+\sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \sum_{j=k+1}^{l} \|X_\omega(I_j)\|^2 \leq l \sum_{k=1}^{l} \|X_\omega(I_k)\|^2 \leq 4\log_2(|J|+1) \sum_{k=1}^{l} \|X_\omega(I_k)\|^2 .$$

After removing all dyadic partition points from J, we are left $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{l}$. Thus

$$\|A_\omega(J)\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{l} \|A_\omega(I_k)\| + 4\log_2(|J|+1) \sum_{k=1}^{l} \|X_\omega(I_k)\|^2 .$$

While apply (27) to each I_k, and use $\sqcup_{k=1}^{l} \{I_k\} \subseteq \sqcup_{k=1}^{l} B_{I_k} \subseteq B_J$ (since I_k are dyadic and $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{l}$ is a finite partition of J, use (15)),

$$\sum_{k=1}^{l} \|A_\omega(I_k)\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{l} \sum_{I \in B_{I_k}} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 \leq \sum_{I \in B_J} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 .$$

$$\text{Therefore, } \|A_\omega(J)\| \leq \sum_{I \in B_J} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 + 4\log_2(|J|+1) \sum_{I \in B_J} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 . \tag{29}$$

Thus, suppose $\{I_j\} \in D_{[2^l,2^{l+1}]}$, $l \geq 1$, use (29) for each I_j, and $\sqcup_j B_{I_j} \subseteq B_{[2^l,2^{l+1}]}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_j \|A_\omega(I_j)\| &\leq \sum_j \left(\sum_{I \in B_{I_j}} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 + 4\log_2(|I_j|+1) \sum_{I \in B_{I_j}} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{I \in B_{[2^l,2^{l+1}]}} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 + 4\log_2\left(2^l+1\right) \sum_{I \in B_{[2^l,2^{l+1}]}} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 \\
&\leq 5\log_2\left(2^l+1\right) \sum_{I \in B_{[2^l,2^{l+1}]}} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

$$\|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[2^l,2^{l+1}]} = \sup_{\{I_j\} \in D_{[2^l,2^{l+1}]}} \sum_j \|A_\omega(I_j)\| \leq 5\log_2\left(2^l+1\right) \sum_{I \in B_{[2^l,2^{l+1}]}} \|X_\omega(I)\|^2 .$$

Integrate both sides, use (17), i.e.

$$\sum_{I\in B_{[2^l,2^{l+1}]}}\int_\Omega \|X_\omega(I)\|^2\mu(d\omega)\leq 2\log_2\left(2^l+1\right)\sum_{k=2^l+1}^{2^{l+1}}|c_k|^2,$$

and $\log_2\left(2^l+1\right)\leq\log_2(k+1)$ when $k\in\left[2^l,2^{l+1}\right]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega\|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[2^l,2^{l+1}]}\mu(d\omega) &\leq 10\left(\log_2\left(2^l+1\right)\right)^2\sum_{k=2^l+1}^{2^{l+1}}|c_k|^2 \qquad (30)\\ &\leq 10\sum_{k=2^l+1}^{2^{l+1}}\left(\log_2(k+1)\right)^2|c_k|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Then, what left is the estimation of the long-time behavior, i.e.(26) about $A_\omega^{11}:=A\left(X_\omega^1\right)$. Based on the definition $X^1:=L\left(X,\{2^n\}\right)$ at the beginning of the proof, if denote

$$v_n(\omega)=\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}}\frac{c_ku_k(\omega)}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}}|c_k|^2}}\text{ and }b_n=\sqrt{\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}}|c_k|^2}. \qquad (31)$$

Then $\{v_n\}$ is an orthonormal system in L^2, and X^1 is the reparametrised partial sum process of $\sum_n b_nv_n$.

Notation: Denote the partial sum process of $\sum_n b_nv_n$ as Z, $A^Z:=A(Z)$.

Since 1-variation is invariant under reparametrisation, so our aim is to prove $\int_\Omega\left\|A_\omega^Z\right\|_{1-var}\mu(d\omega)\leq 32\pi^2\sum_{n=1}^\infty n^2|b_n|^2$, which is actually a modest version of our theorem ($\sum_{n=1}^\infty n^2|b_n|^2\leq\sum_{n=0}^\infty\left(\log_2(n+1)\right)^2|c_n|^2$).

Suppose J is an interval, we decompose J as union of dyadic intervals by Lemma 31 with small modifications: if $[0,2^n]$, $n\geq 1$, appear according to Lemma 31, decompose it as $[0,1]\cup\cup_{k\geq1}^n\left[2^{k-1},2^k\right]$, which does not affect the statement that there are no more than two dyadic intervals of the same level in our decomposition for any level $n\geq1$, but it does affect level 0 with one more possible copy. The reason is that, if the interval $[0,2^n]$ does appear in our decomposition, then it must be at the left most of some interval in the finite partition. According to Lemma 31, in our decomposition, the level of dyadic intervals is strictly decreasing from biggest dyadic interval(s) to left/right. Therefore, since $[0,2^n]$ is at the left most, replacing $[0,2^n]$ by $\cup_{k\geq1}^n\left[2^{k-1},2^k\right]=[1,2^n]$ does not affect the monotonicity of dyadic intervals (the level of $\left[2^{k-1},2^k\right]$, $1\leq k\leq n$, is strictly increasing and less than n), thus does not affect the fact that there are no more than two dyadic intervals of any given level. However, we are left with $[0,1]$, so one more possible level 0 interval.

Having fixed the dyadic partition, we estimate $\left\|A_\omega^Z(J)\right\|$ for interval J by systematically removing dyadic partition points from J. We will first remove the point which define the biggest dyadic subinterval, and kill subintervals level by level, from high to low. We will not touch end points of dyadic intervals of certain level until all the dyadic intervals of higher levels disappear. In this way, the bigger dyadic subintervals merge into one, and absorb the smaller intervals as the process goes.

Denote the dyadic partition of J as $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{l}$ (as we specified, $[0,2^n]$, $n\geq 1$, is not a member of $\{I_k\}$).

For fixed k, $1\leq k\leq l$. If we remove one point which parts our merged big interval J_k and dyadic interval I_k, then the change is bounded by

$$\|Z_\omega(J_k)\|\,\|Z_\omega(I_k)\|\leq\frac{1}{2}\left(\|Z_\omega(J_k)\|^2+\|Z_\omega(I_k)\|^2\right). \tag{32}$$

Denote the level of I_k as $n(I_k)$, then according to the way we remove points, $J_k\subseteq\cup_i\{I_i|I_i\in\{I_k\},\,n(I_i)\geq n(I_k)\}$. Use Hölder inequality,

$$\|Z_\omega(J_k)\|^2\leq 3\left(\sum_{j\geq n(I_k)}\frac{1}{(j+1)^2}\right)\left(\sum_{j\geq n(I_k)}(j+1)^2\sum_{n(I_i)=j}\|Z_\omega(I_i)\|^2\right),$$

There is a 3 came out because there is no more than three dyadic intervals of the same level in our decomposition, so no more than three copies of $(j+1)^{-2}$ in the summation. When we removed all dyadic partition points from J, $I_i\in\{I_k\}$ is counted in $\cup_{k=1}^{l}J_k$ at most $\#\{j|I_j\in\{I_k\},\,n(I_j)\leq n(I_i)\}\leq 2n(I_i)+3$ times, where we used the fact that there are no more than 2 intervals of level n for any $n\geq 1$ in our decomposition, and no more than 3 intervals of level 0. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{l}\|Z_\omega(J_k)\|^2&\leq 3\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^2}\right)\left(\sum_{j\geq 0}(j+1)^2\sum_{n(I_i)=j}\#\{k|n(k)\leq n(I_i)\}\|Z_\omega(I_i)\|^2\right)\\&\leq\frac{\pi^2}{2}\sum_{j\geq 0}(j+1)^2(2j+3)\sum_{n(I_i)=j}\|Z_\omega(I_i)\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

After removing all the partition points, combining the estimation of the A_ω^Z on dyadic interval I_k (i.e.(27)), the error produced by removing points from dyadic partition (i.e.(32) and (33)), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|A_\omega^Z(J)\right\|&\leq\sum_{k=1}^{l}\left\|A_\omega^Z(I_k)\right\|+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{l}\|Z_\omega(I_k)\|^2+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{l}\|Z_\omega(J_k)\|^2 \qquad (34)\\&\leq\sum_{k=1}^{l}\sum_{I\in B_{I_k}\setminus\{I_k\}}\|Z_\omega(I)\|^2+\sum_{k=1}^{l}\|Z_\omega(I_k)\|^2+\frac{\pi^2}{4}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(j+1)^2(2j+3)\sum_{n(I_i)=j}\|Z_\omega(I_i)\|^2\\&=\sum_{k=1}^{l}\sum_{I\in B_{I_k}}\|Z_\omega(I)\|^2+\frac{\pi^2}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(j+1)^2\left(j+\frac{3}{2}\right)\sum_{n(I_k)=j}\|Z_\omega(I_k)\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\{I_k\}$ is are dyadic, so $\sqcup_k \left(B_{I_k} \backslash \{I_k\}\right) \sqcup_k \{I_k\} = \sqcup_k B_{I_k}$.

Recall B_J^j is the set of level j dyadic intervals included in J as defined in Notation 29 in p10, with property (16): If $\{I_k\}$ is a finite partition of J, then for any level $j \geq 0$, $\sqcup_k B_{I_k}^j \subseteq B_J^j$. Moreover, if I_k are all dyadic, then

$$\{I_k | n(I_k) = j\} \subseteq \sqcup_k B_{I_k}^j \subseteq B_J^j. \tag{35}$$

As we modified the dyadic partition of J, $\{I_k\}$ does not include $\left[0, 2^j\right]$, $j \geq 1$. Thus, $\sqcup_k B_{I_k}$ does not include $\left[0, 2^j\right]$, $j \geq 1$ (otherwise if $\left[0, 2^j\right]$, $j \geq 1$, is included in B_{I_k}, so $\left[0, 2^j\right] \subseteq I_k = [0, 2^{j'}]$ for some $j' \geq 1$ since I_k is dyadic, contradictory with our modification). Then in addition to (35), we have

$$\{I_k | n(I_k) = j\} \subseteq \sqcup_k B_{I_k}^j \subseteq B_J^j \backslash \{[0, 2^j]\} \text{ when } j \geq 1.$$

Continue with (34), ($\sum_{n(I_k)=j} \|Z_\omega(I_k)\|^2 \leq \sum_{I \in B_J^j \backslash \{[0,2^j]\}} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2$, $j \geq 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|A_\omega^Z(J)\right\| &\leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\pi^2 + 1\right) \sum_{I \in B_J^0} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2 \qquad (36) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\pi^2}{2}(j+1)^2\left(j + \frac{3}{2}\right) + 1\right) \sum_{I \in B_J^j \backslash \{[0,2^j]\}} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2 \\ &\leq \pi^2 \sum_{I \in B_J^0} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2 + \pi^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (j+1)^3 \sum_{I \in B_J^j \backslash \{[0,2^j]\}} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, when $j \geq 1$, $\frac{\pi^2}{4}(j+1)^2 + 1 \leq \frac{\pi^2}{2}(j+1)^2 \leq \frac{\pi^2}{2}(j+1)^3$.

Suppose $\{I_m\}_{m=1}^M \in D_{[0,2^N]}$, apply (36) to each I_m and use (property (16))

$$\sqcup_m B_{I_m}^j \subseteq B_{[0,2^N]}^j, 0 \leq j \leq N$$

(any dyadic interval in $[0, 2^N]$ is of level less or equal to N),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left\|A_\omega^Z(I_m)\right\| &\leq \pi^2 \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{I \in B_{I_m}^0} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2 + \pi^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} (j+1)^3 \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{I \in B_{I_m}^j \backslash \{[0,2^j]\}} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2 \\ &\leq \pi^2 \sum_{I \in B_{[0,2^N]}^0} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2 + \pi^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} (j+1)^3 \sum_{I \in B_{[0,2^N]}^j \backslash \{[0,2^j]\}} \|Z_\omega(I)\|^2 \\ &= \pi^2 \|Z_\omega([0,1])\|^2 + \pi^2 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (j+1)^3 \sum_{k=1}^{2^{N-j}-1} \left\|Z_\omega\left(\left[k2^j, (k+1)2^j\right]\right)\right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

where $B_{[0,2^N]}^0 = \{[0,1]\} \cup \left\{B_{[0,2^N]}^0 \backslash \{[0,1]\}\right\}$. Take supremum over all finite partitions and integrate

$$\int_\Omega \left\|A_\omega^Z\right\|_{1-var,[0,2^N]} \mu(d\omega) \leq \pi^2 |b_1|^2 + \pi^2 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (j+1)^3 \sum_{n=2^j+1}^{2^N} |c_n|^2.$$

Take limit $N \to \infty$ and use Fatou's Lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \left\|A_\omega^{11}\right\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) &= \int_\Omega \left\|A_\omega^{Z}\right\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) \leq \pi^2 |b_1|^2 + \pi^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (j+1)^3 \sum_{n \geq 2^j+1} |b_n|^2 \\ &= \pi^2 |b_1|^2 + \pi^2 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{[\log_2(n-1)]} (j+1)^3 \right) |b_n|^2 .\end{aligned}$$

When $n \geq 2$, $\log_2(n-1)+1 \leq 2\log_2 n$, and $(\log_2 n)^4 \leq 2n^2$, so $\sum_{j=0}^{[\log_2(n-1)]} (j+1)^3 \leq (\log_2(n-1)+1)^4 \leq 16(\log_2 n)^4 \leq 32n^2$. Hence, using $|b_n|^2 = \sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} |c_k|^2$,

$$\int_\Omega \left\|A_\omega^{11}\right\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) \leq 32\pi^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 |b_n|^2 \leq 32\pi^2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 . \tag{37}$$

Therefore, combine (24), (30), (37) and Lemma 38, use Fatou's lemma, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega \|A_\omega\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) \qquad (38)\\ \leq\ & 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega \|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} \mu(d\omega) + 2\int_\Omega \left\|A_\omega^{11}\right\|_{1-var} + \|X_\omega\|_{2-var}^2 \mu(d\omega) \\ \leq\ & 2\left(10+32\pi^2+36\right) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 \leq 732 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 .\end{aligned}$$

As a result, we proved

$$\int_\Omega \|\mathbf{X}_\omega\|_{G^{(2)}} \mu(d\omega) = \int_\Omega \|X_\omega\|_{2-var}^2 \mu(d\omega) + \int_\Omega \|A_\omega\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) \leq 768 \sum_n (\log_2(n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 .$$

■

Remark 39 *Suppose X_ω and A_ω are as defined in the proof above. One can check that for any $(s,t) \in \triangle_{[0,\infty)}$ and any $\omega \in \Omega$,*

$$\begin{aligned}& A_\omega(s,t) + \frac{1}{2}(X_\omega(t) - X_\omega(s))^{\otimes 2} \\ =\ & \frac{1}{2}\int_{s<u_1<u_2<t} dX_\omega(u_1) \otimes dX_\omega(u_2) - dX_\omega(u_2) \otimes dX_\omega(u_1) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int_{s<u_1<u_2<t} dX_\omega(u_1) \otimes dX_\omega(u_2) + dX_\omega(u_2) \otimes dX_\omega(u_1) \\ =\ & \int_{s<u_1<u_2<t} dX_\omega(u_1) \otimes dX_\omega(u_2) := \left(\int dX_\omega \otimes dX_\omega\right)(s,t) ,\end{aligned}$$

which is a function on $\triangle_{[0,\infty)}$*, we call the "second iterated integral" of* X_ω*. Thus*

$$\left| \|A_\omega\|_{1-var} - \left\| \int dX_\omega \otimes dX_\omega \right\|_{1-var} \right| \le \frac{1}{2} \|X_\omega\|_{2-var}^2 .$$

Therefore, use (38) in Theorem 17 and Lemma 38, we get

$$\int_\Omega \left\| \int dX_\omega \otimes dX_\omega \right\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) \le 750 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2 (n+1))^2 |c_n|^2 .$$

Then $\{(\log_2 (n+1))^2\}$ *is also a Weyl multiplier for the second iterated integral of partial sum process to have finite variation a.e..*

The following decomposition is used in Theorem 16 [12] to prove the first part of our Theorem 19 (finiteness of 2-variation of partial sum process).

Lemma 40 *Every non-dyadic interval* J *can be decomposed as disjoint union of two intervals of positive length* $J = J^1 \cup J^2$*, such that there exist two disjoint dyadic intervals* I_1 *and* I_2*, satisfying* $J^i \subseteq I^i$ *and* $|J^i| > \frac{1}{2}|I^i|$*,* $i = 1, 2$*.*

Proof. First suppose that K is such an interval, that it can be decomposed as disjoint union of dyadic intervals which are strictly monotone in their level, with biggest dyadic interval I_n of level n. We want to find a dyadic interval I, s.t. $K \subseteq I$ and $|K| > \frac{1}{2}|I|$. If $K = I_n$, then I_n is the dyadic interval we want. If $K \neq I_n$, then I_n is a strict subset of K. Since the dyadic intervals in K are strictly monotone in their level, with I_n of level n the biggest dyadic interval at one end, so $K \backslash I_n$ is an interval satisfying $|K \backslash I_n| \le \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^k = 2^n - 1$. Thus, $K \backslash I_n$ is contained in another level n dyadic interval (denoted as I'_n), because $K \backslash I_n$ shares a level n dyadic boundary point with I_n. Therefore, if $I_n \cup I'_n$ constitute a level $n+1$ interval (denoted as I_{n+1}), then K is included I_{n+1}, and $|K| > |I_n| = \frac{1}{2}|I_{n+1}|$. While the condition for $I_n \cup I'_n$ constitute a level $n+1$ dyadic interval is that the boundary point of I_n which it shares with K is a $n+1$ level dyadic point. Thus, suppose K is not dyadic, but can be decomposed as disjoint union of dyadic intervals which are strictly monotone in their level. Then if the boundary point of K which it shares with its biggest dyadic subinterval (of level n) is not only a level n point, but also a level $n+1$ dyadic point, then there exists dyadic interval I, s.t. $K \subset I$ and $|K| > \frac{1}{2}|I|$.

Suppose J is decomposed by Lemma 31, then we select a point in the dyadic partition of J which part J^1 and J^2, such that J^1 and J^2 are in the form of K we discussed above (i.e. satisfies either $C1$ or $C2$, where $C1$: dyadic; $C2$: (1) the level of dyadic intervals changes monotonically, and (2) the boundary point which it shares with its biggest dyadic subinterval (of level n) is not only a level n dyadic point, but also a level $n+1$ dyadic point). According to Lemma 31, there exists a point P in the dyadic partition of J, s.t. $N(P) \ge n(J) + 1$, and the level of dyadic interval to the left and right side of P is strictly decreasing. Thus, if P divides J into two intervals with positive length, then we select P as the point parting J^1 and J^2 and both J^1 and J^2 satisfy $C2(1)$ and $C2(2)$.

While if P is a boundary point of J, then the level of dyadic intervals in J is already monotone. Denote the biggest dyadic interval in J as I_n (of level n), and we select the other boundary point of I_n which divides J into two intervals of positive length: I_n and $J \backslash I_n$. I_n is dyadic so satisfies $C1$. $J \backslash I_n$ is union of monotone dyadic intervals, so satisfies $C2(1)$; the biggest dyadic interval in $J \backslash I_n$ is of level less than n, but shares a level n boundary point with I_n, so $J \backslash I_n$ satisfies $C2(2)$. ■

Remark 41 *As we selected, the point in J dividing J^1 and J^2 is one of the boundary points of biggest dyadic sub-interval(s) of J, and the level of dyadic intervals is strictly decreasing to left and right side of this point.*

Corollary 42 *Suppose J is a non-dyadic finite interval, and J is the union of dyadic intervals which are strictly monotone in their level, denoted as $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^n$. If we bisect $J = J^1 \cup J^2$ according to Lemma 40, and continue to bisect non-dyadic J^1 and/or J^2, so on and so forth, until all intervals left are dyadic. Then the dyadic intervals left are $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^n$.*

Proof. Suppose I_k are arranged in an increasing order according to their position in J, and the level of I_k is strictly increasing (the decreasing case is similar). Then I_n is the biggest dyadic interval, which shares the right boundary point with J. Thus according to Lemma 40, the point inserted is the other boundary point of I_n, which cuts I_n out from J. Since I_n is dyadic, we continue to bisect $\cup_{k=1}^{n-1} I_k$, which is the same as J that it is composed of dyadic intervals which are strictly increasing in their level, so bisecting $\cup_{k=1}^{n-1} I_k$ is to cut I_{n-1} out. Continue this process, cut I_k out one by one. Therefore, when the bisecting process finishes, we are left with dyadic intervals $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^n$. ■

Lemma 43 *Suppose J is an interval. If we bisect $J = J^1 \cup J^2$ according to Lemma 40, and continue to bisect non-dyadic J^1 and/or J^2, so on and so forth, until all intervals left are dyadic. Then the dyadic intervals left constitute the dyadic partition of J by Lemma 31.*

Proof. Suppose the dyadic partition of J by Lemma 31 is $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^n$, where I_k are arranged in an increasing order according to their position in J. Denote P as the point bisecting $J = J^1 \cup J^2$ by Lemma 40. Based on Remark 41, P is one of the boundary points of some I_k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, and the level of dyadic intervals to the left and right side of P is strictly decreasing. Since $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^n$ is a finite partition of J, so J^1 and J^2 are union of I_ks: there exists m, $1 \leq m \leq n-1$, such that $J^1 = \cup_{k=1}^m I_k$ and $J^2 = \cup_{k=m+1}^n I_k$. Moreover, the level of I_k is strictly increasing from $k = 1$ to $k = m$, and strictly decreasing from $k = m+1$ to $k = n$. Thus based on Corollary 42, the dyadic intervals we got after repeatedly bisecting J^1 and J^2 are $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^m \cup \{I_k\}_{k=m+1}^n = \{I_k\}_{k=1}^n$, which is the dyadic partition of J in Lemma 31. ■

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 19, we define $\widetilde{B}_J$ for finite interval J as the set of dyadic intervals which contain "part" of J.

Notation 44 *Suppose J is a finite interval, denote*

$$\widetilde{B}_J := \left\{ I | I \text{ is dyadic, } |I \cap J| > \frac{1}{2}|I| \right\}. \tag{39}$$

Four properties of $\widetilde{B}_J$:

(i) $B_J \subseteq \widetilde{B}_J$.

Proof. Recall B_J is the set of dyadic intervals included in J. Suppose $I \in B_J$, then I is dyadic and $I \subseteq J$, so $|I \cap J| = |I| > \frac{1}{2}|I|$, $I \in \widetilde{B}_J$. ■

(ii) when J is dyadic, $\widetilde{B}_J = B_J$.

Proof. For two dyadic intervals, either one is wholly included in another, or they are disjoint, bar boundary points. Thus, suppose J and I are dyadic intervals and $|I \cap J| > 0$, then either $I \subseteq J$, or $J \subset I$. If $I \subseteq J$, then $I \in B_J \subseteq \widetilde{B}_J$. If $J \subset I$, and $I \in \widetilde{B}_J$, then $|J| < |I| < 2|I \cap J| = 2|J|$, which is not possible since I and J are dyadic. Therefore, when J is dyadic, $\widetilde{B}_J$ is the set of dyadic intervals included in J, thus coincides with B_J. ■

(iii) If $J' \subseteq J$, then $\widetilde{B}_{J'} \subseteq \widetilde{B}_J$.

Proof. Suppose $I \in \widetilde{B}_{J'}$, then $|I \cap J| \geq |I \cap J'| > \frac{1}{2}|I|$, so $I \in \widetilde{B}_J$. ■

(iv) Suppose $\{I_k\}$ is a finite partition of J, then $\sqcup_k \widetilde{B}_{I_k} \subseteq \widetilde{B}_J$.

Proof. $\widetilde{B}_{I_k} \subseteq \widetilde{B}_J$ is from third property. If $I \in \widetilde{B}_{I_{k_1}} \cap \widetilde{B}_{I_{k_2}}$, $k_1 \neq k_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{k_1} \cap I_{k_2}| &\geq |(I \cap I_{k_1}) \cap (I \cap I_{k_2})| \\ &= |I \cap I_{k_1}| + |I \cap I_{k_2}| - |(I \cap I_{k_1}) \cup (I \cap I_{k_2})| \\ &> \frac{1}{2}|I| + \frac{1}{2}|I| - |I| = 0, \end{aligned}$$

contradictory with that I_k are disjoint since $\{I_k\}$ is a finite partition of J. ■

Proof of Theorem 19. Denote the partial sum process of $\sum_n c_n u_n$ as X, and $A := A(X)$. Denote $X^1 := L(X, \{2^n\})$ (Definition 33), and $A^{11} := A(X^1)$. If let

$$v_n(\omega) = \sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} \frac{c_k u_k(\omega)}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} |c_k|^2}}, \quad b_n = \sqrt{\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} |c_k|^2},$$

then X^1 is reparametrised partial sum process of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n v_n$. Since being geometric rough process is invariant under reparametrisation, according to Theorem 17, X^1 is a geometric 2-rough process when $\sum_{n\geq 0} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |b_n|^2 < \infty$. On the other hand, (use $(\log_2(n+1))^2 \leq 2n$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$)

$$\sum_{n\geq 0} (\log_2(n+1))^2 |b_n|^2 \leq 2\sum_{n\geq 1} n|b_n|^2 \leq 2\sum_{n\geq 0} \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2.$$

Thus when $\sum_n \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2 < \infty$, X^1 is a geometric 2-rough process, and (according to Theorem 17)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \left\|X^1_\omega\right\|^2_{2-var} \mu(d\omega) &\leq 72\sum_{n=0}^\infty \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2, \\ \int_\Omega \left\|A^{11}_\omega\right\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) &\leq 1464\sum_{n=0}^\infty \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Therefore, if we can prove that for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} \mu(d\omega) &\leq 4C\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} \log_2(k+1)|c_k|^2, \\ \int_\Omega \|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} \mu(d\omega) &\leq 2(C+1)\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} \log_2(k+1)|c_k|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Then according to Corollary 36 (in p14),

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega \|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var} + \|A_\omega\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) \\ \leq\;& 9|c_1|^2 + 9|c_2|^2 + \int_\Omega 9\left\|X^1_\omega\right\|^2_{2-var} + 2\left\|A^{11}_\omega\right\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) \\ &+\sum_{n=1}^\infty \int_\Omega 9\|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} + 2\|A_\omega\|_{1-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} \mu(d\omega).\end{aligned}$$

Substitute in (40) and (41), we get

$$\int_\Omega \|X_\omega\|^2_{2-var} + \|A_\omega\|_{1-var} \mu(d\omega) \leq (3580+40C)\sum_{n=0}^\infty \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2,$$

where $3580 + 40C = 9 \times 72 + 2 \times 1464 + 36C + 4(1+C)$. Thus, if the two inequalities in (41) are true, then (X, A) is a 2-rough process under the condition $\sum_{n=0}^\infty \log_2(n+1)|c_n|^2 < \infty$, and a geometric 2-rough process since X is of locally bounded variation. Therefore, in the following, we concentrate on two inequalities in (41).

Suppose we are working on $[2^n, 2^{n+1}]$ for some fixed integer $n \geq 1$.

For any fixed finite partition $D = \{[m_k, m_{k+1}]\}_k$ of $[2^n, 2^{n+1}]$, denote the dyadic intervals in D as $\{I_j\}$ (i.e.$[m_k, m_{k+1}]$ which are dyadic), denote the non-dyadic intervals in D as $\{J_k\}$. Use Lemma 40 to bisect non-dyadic intervals: every J_k can be decomposed as disjoint union of J^1_k and J^2_k, such that J^1_k and J^2_k are intervals of positive length, and there exists two disjoint dyadic intervals I^1_k, I^2_k, satisfying $J^i_k \subseteq I^i_k$ and $\left|J^i_k\right| > \frac{1}{2}\left|I^i_k\right|$, $i = 1, 2$. As a result, when bisecting a set of *disjoint* non-dyadic intervals $\{J_k\}$, in the set of related dyadic intervals $\{I^1_k, I^2_k\}$, each dyadic interval is counted at most once. (Otherwise, there are two disjoint J_k^i share the same dyadic interval I, so there must be one J_k^i satisfies $\left|J_k^i\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}|I|$, contradicting with the selection of I.) Denote $\|X\|_{\infty,I} := \sup_{I'\subseteq I}\|X(I')\|$. Then,

$$\sum_{[m_k,m_{k+1}]\in D}\|X_\omega([m_k,m_{k+1}])\|^2 = \sum_k\|X_\omega(J_k)\|^2 + \sum_j\|X_\omega(I_j)\|^2 \tag{42}$$

$$\leq 2\sum_k\left(\left\|X_\omega\left(J_k^1\right)\right\|^2 + \left\|X_\omega\left(J_k^2\right)\right\|^2\right) + \sum_j\|X_\omega(I_j)\|^2$$

$$\leq 2\sum_k\left(\|X_\omega\|_{\infty,I_k^1}^2 + \|X_\omega\|_{\infty,I_k^2}^2\right) + \sum_j\|X_\omega\|_{\infty,I_j}^2 \leq 2\sum_{I\in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}}\|X_\omega\|_{\infty,I}^2,$$

where we used that I_k^1, I_k^2 and I_j are dyadic, and $\left\{I_k^1\right\}\sqcup\left\{I_k^2\right\}\sqcup\{I_j\}\subseteq B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}$. That I_k^i are different as k and i vary, is because J_k^i are disjoint, thus there can not be two J_k^i share the same I; while I_k^i differs from I_j is because if $I_k^i = I_j$ for some i,j,k, then $J_k^i \subseteq I_k^i = I_j$, so $0 < \left|J_k^i\right| = \left|J_k^i\cap I_j\right| \leq |J_k\cap I_j|$, contradicting with that J_k and I_j are disjoint since they are elements of finite partition D. Thus, use (42) and take supremum over all finite partitions of $\left[2^n,2^{n+1}\right]$, we get,

$$\|X_\omega\|_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]}^2 \leq 2\sum_{I\in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}}\|X_\omega\|_{\infty,I}^2.$$

Using the assumption (Hardy property) that for any interval I, $\int_\Omega\|X_\omega\|_{\infty,I}^2\mu(d\omega) \leq C\int_\Omega\|X_\omega(I)\|^2\mu(d\omega)$ and (17), i.e.

$$\sum_{I\in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}}\int_\Omega\|X_\omega(I)\|^2\mu(d\omega) \leq 2\log_2(2^n+1)\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}}|c_k|^2,$$

we get, for any integer n,

$$\int_\Omega\|X_\omega\|_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]}^2\mu(d\omega) \leq 2\int_\Omega\sum_{I\in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}}\|X_\omega\|_{\infty,I}^2\mu(d\omega) \tag{43}$$

$$\leq 2C\sum_{I\in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}}\int_\Omega\|X_\omega(I)\|^2\mu(d\omega) \leq 4C\log_2(2^n+1)\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}}|c_k|^2$$

$$\leq 4C\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}}\log_2(k+1)|c_k|^2.$$

Then we estimate 1-variation of A_ω on $\left[2^n,2^{n+1}\right]$. On dyadic interval $I\subseteq\left[2^n,2^{n+1}\right]$, use (27):

$$\|A_\omega(I)\| \leq \sum_{I'\in B_I\setminus\{I\}}\|X_\omega(I')\|^2. \tag{44}$$

Suppose $J \subseteq \left[2^n, 2^{n+1}\right]$ is a non-dyadic interval. Use Lemma 40 to bisect $J = J^1 \cup J^2$, with J^i of positive length, and associated dyadic intervals I^i. Then according to Lemma 40, $\left|I^i \cap J\right| = \left|J^i\right| > \frac{1}{2}\left|I^i\right|$, so $I^i \in \widetilde{B}_J$, $i = 1, 2$ ($\widetilde{B}_J$ is defined at (39)), and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|A_\omega\left(J\right)\right\| &\leq \left\|A_\omega\left(J^1\right)\right\| + \left\|A_\omega\left(J^2\right)\right\| + \left\|X_\omega\left(J^1\right)\right\|\left\|X_\omega\left(J^2\right)\right\| \\ &\leq \left\|A_\omega\left(J^1\right)\right\| + \left\|A_\omega\left(J^2\right)\right\| + \left\|X_\omega\right\|^2_{\infty, I^1} + \left\|X_\omega\right\|^2_{\infty, I^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The bisecting process terminates if both J^1 and J^2 are dyadic, otherwise, continue to bisect non-dyadic J^1 and/or J^2, so on and so forth, until all the intervals left are dyadic. According to Lemma 43, all the dyadic intervals left constitute the dyadic partition of J in Lemma 31.

The dyadic intervals, which are by-products of our sequence of bisections (e.g. I^1 and I^2 from bisecting J), are elements of $\widetilde{B}_J$, because if dyadic interval I is obtained from bisecting interval $J' \subseteq J$, then $I \in \widetilde{B}_{J'} \subseteq \widetilde{B}_J$ ($I \in \widetilde{B}_{J'}$ is the same reason as I^1, $I^2 \in \widetilde{B}_J$; $\widetilde{B}_{J'} \subseteq \widetilde{B}_J$ is (iii) in p25). Moreover, these by-product dyadic intervals differ from one another. Otherwise, suppose $J^{(1)}$ and $J^{(2)}$ are two different intervals generated in the bisecting process, sharing the same dyadic interval I, i.e. $J^{(i)} \subseteq I$, and $\left|J^{(i)}\right| > \frac{1}{2}\left|I\right|$, $i = 1, 2$, then $\left|J^{(1)} \cap J^{(2)}\right| > 0$, and I is the smallest dyadic interval which includes $J^{(1)}(J^{(2)})$. Since $J^{(1)}$ and $J^{(2)}$ are sub-intervals generated in the process of decomposing J, so if $\left|J^{(1)} \cap J^{(2)}\right| > 0$, then one is wholly included in another. Thus, without loss of generality, suppose $J^{(2)} \subset J^{(1)}$, then $J^{(2)}$ is obtained from further bisecting $J^{(1)}$. When bisecting $J^{(1)}$, according to Lemma 40, there exist two disjoint dyadic intervals I' and I'', s.t. $\left|J^{(1)} \cap I'\right| > 0$, $\left|J^{(1)} \cap I''\right| > 0$. Since $J^{(2)}$ is obtained from further bisecting $J^{(1)}$, so without loss of generality, assume $J^{(2)} \subseteq I'$. As we denoted, I is the smallest dyadic interval containing $J^{(2)}$, so $I \subseteq I'$, while I is also the smallest dyadic interval containing $J^{(1)}$, so $J^{(1)} \subseteq I$, thus $J^{(1)} \subseteq I'$, contradictory with that I' and I'' are disjoint and $\left|J^{(1)} \cap I''\right| > 0$.

Therefore, if denote the dyadic partition of J in Lemma 31 as $\cup_k I_k$, use the estimation for A_ω on dyadic intervals (i.e.(27)), we get (all by-products dyadic intervals are elements of $\widetilde{B}_J$, and they are different from one another),

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|A_\omega\left(J\right)\right\| &\leq \sum_k \left\|A_\omega\left(I_k\right)\right\| + \sum_{I \in \widetilde{B}_J.} \left\|X_\omega\right\|^2_{\infty, I} \qquad (45) \\ &\leq \sum_k \sum_{I \in B_{I_k} \setminus \{I_k\}} \left\|X_\omega\left(I\right)\right\|^2 + \sum_{I \in \widetilde{B}_J} \left\|X_\omega\right\|^2_{\infty, I} \leq \sum_{I \in B_J} \left\|X_\omega\left(I\right)\right\|^2 + \sum_{I \in \widetilde{B}_J} \left\|X_\omega\right\|^2_{\infty, I}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sqcup_k B_{I_k} \setminus \{I_k\} \subset \sqcup_k B_{I_k} \subseteq B_J$ ($\{I_k\}$ is a dyadic partition of J, and use (15)).

Therefore, suppose $\{I_j\}$ is a finite partition of $\left[2^n, 2^{n+1}\right]$, combine estimation on dyadic intervals($I_j \in B_{[2^n, 2^{n+1}]}$) in (44) and on non-dyadic intervals($I_j \notin$

$B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}$) in (45),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_j \left\|A_\omega\left(I_j\right)\right\| \\
= &\sum_{j, I_j \in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}} \left\|A_\omega\left(I_j\right)\right\| + \sum_{j, I_j \notin B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}} \left\|A_\omega\left(I_j\right)\right\| \\
\leq &\sum_{j, I_j \in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}} \sum_{I \in B_{I_j} \backslash \{I_j\}} \left\|X_\omega\left(I\right)\right\|^2 + \sum_{j, I_j \notin B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}} \Big(\sum_{I \in B_{I_j}} \left\|X_\omega\left(I\right)\right\|^2 + \sum_{I \in \widetilde{B}_{I_j}} \left\|X_\omega\right\|_{\infty, I}^2 \Big) \\
\leq &\sum_j \sum_{I \in B_{I_j}} \left\|X_\omega\left(I\right)\right\|^2 + \sum_j \sum_{I \in \widetilde{B}_{I_j}} \left\|X_\omega\right\|_{\infty, I}^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Use $\sqcup_j B_{I_j} \subseteq B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}$ (according to (15)), $\sqcup_j \widetilde{B}_{I_j} \subseteq \widetilde{B}_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}$ (according to (iv) in p25), and $B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]} = \widetilde{B}_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}$ for dyadic interval $\left[2^n, 2^{n+1}\right]$ (according to (ii) in p25), we get

$$\left\|A_\omega\right\|_{1-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} = \sup_{\{I_j\} \in D_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}} \sum_j \left\|A_\omega\left(I_j\right)\right\| \leq \sum_{I \in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}} \left(\left\|X_\omega\left(I\right)\right\|^2 + \left\|X_\omega\right\|_{\infty, I}^2 \right).$$

Integrate both sides, use $\int_\Omega \left\|X\right\|_{\infty,I}^2 \mu\left(d\omega\right) \leq C \int_\Omega \left\|X\left(I\right)\right\|^2 \mu\left(d\omega\right)$, and (17), i.e.

$$\sum_{I \in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}} \int_\Omega \left\|X_\omega\left(I\right)\right\|^2 \mu\left(d\omega\right) \leq 2 \log_2\left(2^n + 1\right) \sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} \left|c_k\right|^2,$$

we get, for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \left\|A_\omega\right\|_{1-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} \mu\left(d\omega\right) &\leq (1 + C) \sum_{I \in B_{[2^n,2^{n+1}]}} \int_\Omega \left\|X_\omega\left(I\right)\right\|^2 \mu\left(d\omega\right) \qquad (46) \\
&\leq 2\left(1 + C\right) \sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} \log_2\left(k+1\right) \left|c_k\right|^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Combined with reasoning at the beginning of the proof and (43), proof finishes. ■

5 Sobolev spaces H^s_{Log}

In this section, we identify an equivalent norm on the space of functions whose Fourier coefficients satisfy $\sum_n \left(\log_2\left(n+1\right)\right)^{2s} \left|c_n\right|^2 < \infty$ for some $s > 0$. We also construct an example to show that $\sum_n w\left(n\right) \left|c_n\right|^2 < \infty$ is not necessary for the partial sum process of Fourier series to be a geometric 2-rough process, for any Weyl multiplier $\{w\left(n\right)\}$ increasing faster than $\{\left(\log_2 \log_2 n\right)^2\}$.

Let H^{δ} be the sobolev space $W^{\delta,2}$. The fact that $f:[-\pi,\pi]\rightarrow\mathbb{R}^{d}$ belongs to H^{δ} for some $0<\delta<1$, can be stated equivalently in the following two ways (Theorem 8.6 in [11]):

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}n^{2\delta}\left|c_{n}\right|^{2}<\infty, \tag{47}$$

and

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{\left|f\left(u\right)-f\left(v\right)\right|^{2}}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|^{2\delta+1}}dudv<\infty. \tag{48}$$

with $\{c_{n}\}$ the Fourier coefficients of f (suppose $f=\left(f_{1},f_{2},\ldots,f_{d}\right)$, then $c_{n}=\left(c_{n}^{1},c_{n}^{2},\ldots,c_{n}^{d}\right)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, with $c_{n}^{k}=\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}f_{k}\left(\theta\right)e^{in\theta}d\theta$). When $\delta=0$, the space defined by (48) is strictly included in L^{2}, which, as we will prove, is equivalent to

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\log_{2}\left(n+1\right)\left|c_{n}\right|^{2}<\infty.$$

To fit the framework of our theorems,

Definition 45 *Define sobolev spaces H_{Log}^{s}, $-\infty<s<\infty$, as the linear space of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ valued functions on $[-\pi,\pi]$ with finite the following norm:*

$$\left\Vert f\right\Vert_{Log,s}:=\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\log_{2}\left(n+1\right)\right)^{2s}\left|c_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{49}$$

where $\{c_{n}\}$ are Fourier coefficients of f.

Similar to H^{s}, H_{Log}^{s} is a separable Hilbert space for any $-\infty<s<\infty$, with trigonometric polynomials as a dense subset; H_{Log}^{-s} is the dual space of H_{Log}^{s}; and H_{Log}^{q} can be compactly embedded into H_{Log}^{p} for any $q>p$. Moreover, for the interpolation space $\left(H_{Log}^{p},H_{Log}^{q}\right)_{\theta,2}=H_{Log}^{r}$, where $r=\left(1-\theta\right)p+\theta q$, Hölder inequality holds:

$$\left\Vert f\right\Vert_{Log,r}\leq\left\Vert f\right\Vert_{Log,p}^{1-\theta}\left\Vert f\right\Vert_{Log,q}^{\theta}.$$

All these properties can be proved as counterparts as those of H^{δ} (e.g. p108-p117, [11]).

The function

$$f_{s,\epsilon}\left(x\right)=\frac{1}{x^{\frac{1}{2}}\left|\log_{2}\frac{x}{2}\right|^{s+\frac{1}{2}}\left|\log_{2}\left(2\left|\log_{2}\frac{x}{2}\right|\right)\right|^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}},\ \ x\in\left(0,1\right),$$

(according to Theorem 2.24 at p190 in Vol I [29]) belongs to H_{Log}^{s} when $\epsilon>0$, not belongs to H_{Log}^{s} when $\epsilon\leq0$.

Next, we prove that there exists an equivalent norm on H_{Log}^{s} as the one for H^{s} in (48), which is inspired by Theorem 8.6 in [11].

Firstly, we prove three little lemmas.

Lemma 46 *Suppose $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $g(x) = g(-x)$, $g(x) = g(\pi - x)$. Then for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \neq n$,*

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \operatorname{Re}\left(\left(e^{imu} - e^{imv}\right)\overline{\left(e^{inu} - e^{inv}\right)}\right) g\left(\frac{u-v}{2}\right) dudv = 0. \tag{50}$$

Proof.

$$e^{imu} - e^{imv} = e^{i\frac{m}{2}(u+v)} 2i \sin\left(\frac{m}{2}(u-v)\right),$$

$$\operatorname{Re}\left(\left(e^{imu} - e^{imv}\right)\overline{\left(e^{inu} - e^{inv}\right)}\right) = 4\cos\left(\frac{m-n}{2}(u+v)\right)\sin\left(\frac{m}{2}(u-v)\right)\sin\left(\frac{n}{2}(u-v)\right).$$

Denote $\xi := \frac{u+v}{2}$, $\eta := \frac{u-v}{2}$, then (50) becomes (since $m \neq n$):

$$\begin{aligned}
& 32\int_0^{\pi}\int_0^{\pi-\eta} \cos\left((m-n)\xi\right) d\xi \sin(m\eta)\sin(n\eta) g(\eta) d\eta \\
= \ & \frac{32(-1)^{m-n+1}}{m-n}\int_0^{\pi} \sin\left((m-n)\eta\right)\sin(m\eta)\sin(n\eta) g(\eta) d\eta \\
= \ & \frac{32(-1)^{m-n+1}}{m-n}\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sin\left((m-n)\eta\right)\sin(m\eta)\sin(n\eta)\left(g(\eta) - g(\pi-\eta)\right) d\eta = 0
\end{aligned}$$

■

Lemma 47 *Suppose $a > b > 1$, and real-valued function g defined on $(0,1)$ is non-negative, for which the following integrations have meaning. Then*

when $s \geq 0$, $\int_0^1 g(t)\left(\log_2\frac{b}{t}\right)^s dt \leq \int_0^1 g(t)\left(\log_2\frac{a}{t}\right)^s dt \leq (\log_b a)^s \int_0^1 g(t)\left(\log_2\frac{b}{t}\right)^s dt,$

when $s < 0$, $\int_0^1 g(t)\left(\log_2\frac{b}{t}\right)^s dt \geq \int_0^1 g(t)\left(\log_2\frac{a}{t}\right)^s dt \geq (\log_b a)^s \int_0^1 g(t)\left(\log_2\frac{b}{t}\right)^s dt.$

Proof. when $t \in (0,1)$, $\log_2\frac{a}{t} > 0$, $\log_2\frac{b}{t} > 0$, and

$$1 \leq \frac{\log_2\frac{a}{t}}{\log_2\frac{b}{t}} = \frac{\log_2 a + \log_2\frac{1}{t}}{\log_2 b + \log_2\frac{1}{t}} \leq \frac{\log_2 a}{\log_2 b} = \log_b a.$$

■

Lemma 48 *Suppose $s \in (0,\infty)$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if denote*

$$T_n^s := \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\left|\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}n(u-v)\right)\right|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|}\left(\log_2\frac{\pi}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|}\right)^{2s-1} dudv,$$

$$R_n^s := \int_0^1 \frac{\left|\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\pi n t\right)\right|^2}{t}\left(\log_2\frac{2}{t}\right)^{2s-1} dt.$$

$$\text{Then, } 4\pi R_n^s \leq T_n^s \leq 8\pi^2\left(\log_2\pi\right)^{2s-1} R_n^s, \text{ when } s \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

$$4\pi\left(\log_2\pi\right)^{2s-1} R_n^s \leq T_n^s \leq 8\pi^2 R_n^s, \text{ when } 0 < s < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. Denote $\xi := \frac{u+v}{2}$, $\eta := \frac{u-v}{2}$, then

$$T_n^s = 8\int_0^\pi \int_0^{\pi-\eta} d\xi \frac{|\sin n\eta|^2}{\sin \eta}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin \eta})^{2s-1} d\eta.$$

Since

$$\left\{(\xi,\eta)\,|0 \le \eta \le \frac{\pi}{2}, 0 \le \xi \le \frac{\pi}{2}\right\} \subset \{(\xi,\eta)\,|\eta \ge 0, 0 \le \xi \le \pi - \eta\}$$
$$\subset \{(\xi,\eta)\,|0 \le \eta \le \pi, 0 \le \xi \le \pi\},$$

so

$$4\pi \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{|\sin(nt)|^2}{\sin t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin t})^{2s-1} dt \le T_n^s \le 8\pi \int_0^\pi \frac{|\sin(nt)|^2}{\sin t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin t})^{2s-1} dt.$$

While

$$\int_0^\pi \frac{|\sin(nt)|^2}{\sin t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin t})^{2s-1} dt = 2\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{|\sin(nt)|^2}{\sin t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin t})^{2s-1} dt,$$

so if denote

$$\widetilde{R_n^s} := \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{|\sin(nt)|^2}{\sin t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin t})^{2s-1} dt, \tag{51}$$

then

$$4\pi \widetilde{R_n^s} \le T_n^s \le 16\pi \widetilde{R_n^s}. \tag{52}$$

On the other hand, when $t \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]$, $\frac{2}{\pi}t \le \sin t \le t$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{t})^{2s-1} &\le \frac{1}{\sin t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin t})^{2s-1} \le \frac{\pi}{2}\frac{1}{t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi^2}{2t})^{2s-1}, \text{ when } s \ge \frac{1}{2}; \\ \frac{1}{t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi^2}{2t})^{2s-1} &\le \frac{1}{\sin t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin t})^{2s-1} \le \frac{\pi}{2}\frac{1}{t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{t})^{2s-1}, \text{ when } 0 < s < \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, when $s \ge \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\left|\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\pi nt\right)\right|^2}{t}(\log_2 \frac{2}{t})^{2s-1} dt \le \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{|\sin(nt)|^2}{\sin t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\sin t})^{2s-1} dt \tag{53}$$
$$\le \frac{\pi}{2}\int_0^1 \frac{\left|\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\pi nt\right)\right|^2}{t}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{t})^{2s-1} dt \le \frac{\pi}{2}\left(\log_2 \pi\right)^{2s-1} \int_0^1 \frac{\left|\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\pi nt\right)\right|^2}{t}(\log_2 \frac{2}{t})^{2s-1} dt,$$

where in the last step, we used Lemma 47. With R_n defined in statement of this lemma and $\widetilde{R_n^s}$ defined at (51), simplify the notation of (53), we get

$$R_n^s \le \widetilde{R_n^s} \le \frac{\pi}{2}\left(\log_2 \pi\right)^{2s-1} R_n^s, \text{ when } s \ge \frac{1}{2}.$$

Similarly,

$$\left(\log_2 \pi\right)^{2s-1} R_n^s \le \widetilde{R_n^s} \le \frac{\pi}{2} R_n^s, \text{ when } 0 < s < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Combined with (52), proof finishes. ■

Theorem 21 *For any* $0 < s < \infty$, *there exist constants* $0 < k_s \leq K_s < \infty$, *such that for any* $f \in L^2\left([-\pi,\pi],\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ *with Fourier coefficients* $\{c_n\}$,

$$\text{if denote } L(f) := \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{|f(u)-f(v)|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|})^{2s-1} dudv \tag{54}$$

$$\text{and } l(f) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\log_2(n+1))^{2s} |c_n|^2 \text{, then } k_s l(f) \leq L(f) \leq K_s l(f).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume f is one-dimensional. Since trigonometric polynomials are dense in H^s_{Log}, we only prove the theorem for trigonometric polynomials. Based on Lemma 46, $g(x) := \frac{1}{|\sin x|}(\log_2 \frac{\pi}{|\sin x|})^{2s-1}$ satisfy $g(x) = g(-x)$, $g(x) = g(\pi - x)$, so trigonometric monomials (e^{inx}, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$) are orthogonal w.r.t. this inner product:

$$\langle f_1, f_2\rangle = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\operatorname{Re}\left((f_1(u)-f_1(v))\overline{(f_2(u)-f_2(v))}\right)}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|}(\log_2\frac{\pi}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|})^{2s-1}dudv.$$

Thus, (since $L\left(e^{inx}\right) = L\left(e^{-inx}\right)$ and $|c_n|^2 = |c_{-n}|^2$, $L(f)$ as defined at (54)) the problem boils down to prove: for any $s \in (0,\infty)$, there exist $0 < k_s \leq K_s < \infty$, such that

$$k_s(\log_2(n+1))^{2s} \leq L\left(e^{inx}\right) \leq K_s(\log_2(n+1))^{2s}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{55}$$

Since (55) holds for $n = 0$, and $L\left(e^{inx}\right) > 0$, $\log_2(n+1) > 0$ when $n \geq 1$, so we only need to prove (55) for sufficient large ns. According to Lemma 48, when $s \in (0,\infty)$, if denote

$$R^s_n := \int_0^1 \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\pi n t\right)}{t}\left|\log_2\frac{t}{2}\right|^{2s-1}dt, \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

then there exists $0 < a_s \leq A_s < \infty$,

$$a_s R^s_n \leq L\left(e^{inx}\right) \leq A_s R^s_n, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, we are done, if we can prove that there exist constants $0 < b_s \leq B_s < \infty$, s.t. for all sufficiently large ns ($1 \leq \frac{(\log_2(n\pi))^{2s}}{(\log_2(n+1))^{2s}} \leq 2^{2s}$, $\forall n \geq 1$),

$$b_s(\log_2(\pi n))^{2s} \leq R^s_n \leq B_s(\log_2(\pi n))^{2s}.$$

Denote

$$R^s_n = \int_0^{\pi n}\frac{\sin^2\frac{1}{2}t}{t}\left|\log_2\frac{t}{2} - \log_2(\pi n)\right|^{2s-1}dt = \int_0^1 + \int_1^{\pi n} := R^s_1(n) + R^s_2(n).$$

For $R_1^s(n)$,

$$\frac{R_1^s(n)}{(\log_2(\pi n))^{2s-1}} = \int_0^1 \frac{\sin^2 \frac{1}{2}t}{t} \left| \frac{1}{\log_2(\pi n)} \log_2 \frac{t}{2} - 1 \right|^{2s-1} dt.$$

When $n \geq 1$,

$$1 \leq \left| \frac{1}{\log_2(\pi n)} \log_2 \frac{t}{2} - 1 \right| \leq 1 + \left| \log_2 \frac{t}{2} \right| \quad \text{when } t \in (0,1).$$

Thus when $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$,

$$0 < \int_0^1 \frac{\sin^2 \frac{1}{2}t}{t} dt \leq \frac{R_1^s(n)}{(\log_2(\pi n))^{2s-1}} \leq \int_0^1 \frac{\sin^2 \frac{1}{2}t}{t} \left(1 + \left| \log_2 \frac{t}{2} \right| \right)^{2s-1} dt < \infty. \tag{56}$$

When $0 < s < \frac{1}{2}$, the upper bound and lower bound in (56) exchange. Thus, $R_1^s(n) \sim (\log_2(\pi n))^{2s-1}$, and for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N_\epsilon \geq 1$, s.t.

$$|R_1^s(n)| \leq \epsilon (\log_2(\pi n))^{2s}, \ \forall n \geq N_\epsilon. \tag{57}$$

For $R_2^s(n)$,

$$\frac{R_2^s(n)}{(\log_2(\pi n))^{2s}} = \frac{1}{\log_2(\pi n)} \int_1^{\pi n} \frac{\sin^2 \frac{1}{2}t}{t} \left| \frac{1}{\log_2(\pi n)} \log_2 \frac{t}{2} - 1 \right|^{2s-1} dt. \tag{58}$$

When $1 \leq t \leq \sqrt{n}\pi$, (since $\log_s \frac{\pi}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \pi$)

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{\log_2(\pi n)} \log_2 \frac{t}{2} \leq \frac{1}{\log_2(\pi n)} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + \log_s \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

so

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \left| \frac{1}{\log_2(\pi n)} \log_2 \frac{t}{2} - 1 \right| \leq 1 \text{ when } 1 \leq t \leq \sqrt{n}\pi.$$

Denote $[\sqrt{n}\,]$ as the integer part of $\sqrt{n}$, then when $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$, $n \geq 1$,

$$\frac{R_2^s(n)}{(\log_2(\pi n))^{2s}} \geq \frac{1}{2^{2s-1} \log_2(\pi n)} \sum_{k=1}^{[\sqrt{n}\,]-1} \int_{k\pi}^{(k+1)\pi} \frac{\sin^2 \frac{1}{2}t}{t} dt \geq \frac{1}{2^{2s} \log_2(\pi n)} \sum_{k=1}^{[\sqrt{n}\,]-1} \frac{1}{k+1}.$$

While $\displaystyle\sum_{k=1}^{[\sqrt{n}\,]-1} \frac{1}{k+1} = \sum_{k=1}^{[\sqrt{n}\,]} \frac{1}{k} - 1 \geq \int_1^{[\sqrt{n}\,]+1} \frac{1}{x} dx - 1 = \ln\left([\sqrt{n}\,] + 1\right) - 1 \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln(n) - 1$,

so for $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$, when $n \geq \left[e^4 \pi\right] + 1$, $\frac{\ln n - 2}{\ln n + \ln \pi} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\frac{R_2^s(n)}{(\log_2(\pi n))^{2s}} \geq \frac{\ln 2 (\ln n - 2)}{2^{2s+1} (\ln n + \ln \pi)} \geq \frac{\ln 2}{2^{2s+2}}.$$

Similarly, for $0 < s < \frac{1}{2}$, when $n \geq \left[e^4\pi\right] + 1$,

$$\frac{R_2^s(n)}{\left(\log_2(\pi n)\right)^{2s}} \geq \frac{\ln 2}{8}.$$

For the upper bound of $\frac{R_2^s(n)}{(\log_2(\pi n))^{2s}}$, in (58) let $y = \frac{\log_2 \frac{t}{2}}{\log_2(\pi n)}$ $(0 \leq \frac{\log_2 \frac{\pi n}{2}}{\log_2(\pi n)} \leq 1)$

$$\frac{R_2^s(n)}{\left(\log_2(\pi n)\right)^{2s}} \leq \ln 2 \int_0^1 \sin^2\left((\pi n)^y\right)(1-y)^{2s-1}\,dy \leq \ln 2 \int_0^1 (1-y)^{2s-1}\,dy_1 = \frac{\ln 2}{2s}.$$

Therefore, if for $s > 0$ let $\epsilon(s) = \frac{1}{2}\min\left\{\frac{\ln 2}{2^{2s+2}}, \frac{\ln 2}{8}\right\}$, then according to (57), there exists integer $N_{\epsilon(s)} \geq 1$, s.t. for any $n \geq N_{\epsilon(s)}$, $|R_1^s(n)| \leq \epsilon(s)\left(\log_2(\pi n)\right)^{2s}$. Thus, for any $n \geq \max\left\{N_{\epsilon(s)}, \left[e^4\pi\right] + 1\right\}$, we have

$$\frac{\ln 2}{2^{2s+3}} \leq \frac{R_n^s}{\left(\log_2(\pi n)\right)^{2s}} \leq \frac{\ln 2}{2s} + \frac{\ln 2}{2^{2s+3}}, \text{ when } s \geq \frac{1}{2};$$
$$\frac{\ln 2}{16} \leq \frac{R_n^s}{\left(\log_2(\pi n)\right)^{2s}} \leq \frac{\ln 2}{2s} + \frac{\ln 2}{16}, \text{ when } 0 < s < \frac{1}{2},$$

where we used $R_2^s(n) - |R_1^s(n)| \leq R_n^s \leq R_2^s(n) + |R_1^s(n)|$. Combined with reasoning at the beginning of the proof, proof finishes. ■

Remark 49 *Since $g(x) = 1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfy $g(x) = g(-x)$ and $g(x) = g(\pi - x)$, so according to Lemma 46,*

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \operatorname{Re}\left(\left(e^{imu} - e^{imv}\right)\overline{\left(e^{inu} - e^{inv}\right)}\right) dudv = 0, \text{ when } m \neq n.$$

Thus, following similar but simpler line of reasoning, one can prove that there exists constants $0 < k < K < \infty$, s.t.

$$k\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(x)|^2\,dx \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(u) - f(v)|^2\,dudv \leq K\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(x)|^2\,dx.$$

Then $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(u) - f(v)|^2\,dudv < \infty$ iff f is in L^2. Since $\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right| \leq 1$, so from this perspective, one can also get that

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{|f(u) - f(v)|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|}dudv < \infty \Longrightarrow f \text{ is an } L^2 \text{ function.}$$

Combining Theorem 21 with Corollary 20(in p8), we get that if

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{|f(u) - f(v)|^2}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|}dudv < \infty,$$

then f is in L^2(also Remark 49), and the partial sum process of Fourier series of f is a geometric 2-rough process (denoted as $\mathbf{X}$). Moreover, there exists constant C, s.t.

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left\|\mathbf{X}\left(\theta\right)\right\|_{G^{(2)}}d\theta\leq C\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{\left|f\left(u\right)-f\left(v\right)\right|^{2}}{\left|\sin\frac{u-v}{2}\right|}dudv\sim\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\log_{2}\left(n+1\right)\left|c_{n}\right|^{2}$$

However, as we show below, the Weyl multiplier $\{\log_2(n+1)\}$ is not necessary for the partial sum process of Fourier series to be a geometric 2-rough process.

Example 50 *There exists an L^2 Fourier series: $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}c_n e^{in\theta}$, s.t. its partial sum process is a geometric 2-rough process, but $\sum_n \log_2(n+1)\left|c_n\right|^2=\infty$.*

The same example can be modified to any Weyl multiplier growing faster than $\{(\log_2\log_2 n)^2\}$, as in Example 23 proved after this example.
Proof. Define

$$f\left(\theta\right)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n2^{\frac{n}{2}}}\sum_{k=2^{n}+1}^{2^{n+1}}e^{ik\theta},\ \ \theta\in[0,2\pi). \tag{59}$$

Then f is in L^2, and $\left|c_n\right|^2\sim n^{-1}\left(\log_2 n\right)^{-2}$. The partial sum process of f is,

$$X_{\theta}\left(k\right)=\frac{e^{i(2^{n}+1)\theta}-e^{i(k+1)\theta}}{n2^{\frac{n}{2}}\left(1-e^{i\theta}\right)}+X_{\theta}\left(2^{n}\right),\,k\in\left[2^{n}+1,2^{n+1}\right]\cap\mathbb{N}, \tag{60}$$

and linear between adjacent integers. Suppose $X^1=L\left(X,\{2^n\}\right)$ (Definition 33). Then X^1 is a geometric 2-rough process. (Denote $2^{-\frac{n}{2}}\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}}e^{ik\theta}$ as $v_n\left(\theta\right)$, then $\{v_n\}$ is an orthonormal system, and X^1 is the reparametrised partial sum process of $\sum_n\frac{1}{n}v_n$. Since being a geometric rough process is invariant under reparametrisation and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\log_2 n)^2}{n^2}<\infty$, so according to Theorem 17, X^1 is a geometric 2-rough process.) Denote $A:=A\left(X\right)$ as the area process of X. Based on Corollary 36(in p14), we are done if we can prove,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\left\|X_{\theta}\right\|_{2-var,[2^{n},2^{n+1}]}^{2}+\left\|A_{\theta}\right\|_{1-var,[2^{n},2^{n+1}]}\right)<\infty\text{ a.e.}. \tag{61}$$

When $\theta=0$, $\left\|X_\theta\right\|_{1-var}=\infty$, so (X_0,A_0) is not a geometric 2-rough path. In the following, we prove that (61) holds for any $\theta\in(0,2\pi)$. More specifically, we prove that, for any $\theta\in(0,2\pi)$, there exists constant C_θ, s.t.

$$\left\|X_{\theta}\right\|_{2-var,[2^{n},2^{n+1}]}^{2}+\left\|A_{\theta}\right\|_{1-var,[2^{n},2^{n+1}]}\leq\frac{C_{\theta}}{n^{2}},\forall n\geq\max\left\{\log_{2}(\frac{2\pi}{\theta}),1\right\}.$$

For each fixed $\theta\in(0,2\pi)$, only finitely many ns satisfy $n<\log_2\left(\frac{2\pi}{\theta}\right)$, so $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(\left\|X_\theta\right\|_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]}^2+\left\|A_\theta\right\|_{1-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]})<\infty$ for every $\theta\in(0,2\pi)$.

We do analysis for fixed $\theta\in(0,2\pi)$ and on fixed interval $\left[2^n,2^{n+1}\right]$ for integer $n\geq\max\{\log_2(\frac{2\pi}{\theta}),1\}$.

Denote integer $J := \left[\frac{2^n\theta}{2\pi}\right]$ (the integer part of $\frac{2^n\theta}{2\pi}$) and denote $t_j := \frac{2j\pi}{\theta}$ for integer $0 \le j \le J$. Then $J \ge 1$ since $n \ge \log_2(\frac{2\pi}{\theta})$.

In (60) for fixed θ and fixed n: $X_\theta\left(2^n\right)$, n, $2^{\frac{n}{2}}$, $1-e^{i\theta}$ and $e^{i(2^n+1)\theta}$ are constants, so equivalently, we work on the continuous piecewise linear path Y on $[0,\infty)$ obtained by interpolating at integer k the value:

$$Y\left(k\right) := e^{ik\theta},\ 0 \le k \le 2^n,$$

and $Y\left(t\right) = e^{i2^n\theta}$ when $t \in (2^n,\infty)$. In fact, we use the continuous version of Y:

$$\widetilde{Y}\left(t\right) = \begin{cases} e^{it\theta} & \text{when } t \in [0,2^n] \\ e^{i2^n\theta} & \text{when } t \in (2^n,\infty) \end{cases}.$$

Then $Y\left(k\right) = \widetilde{Y}\left(k\right)$, for integer $0 \le k \le 2^n$, and $\widetilde{Y}\left(t_j\right) = 1$, $0 \le j \le J$.

First, we estimate 2-variation of Y. Since Y is a discretization of $\widetilde{Y}$, the 2-variation of Y is bounded by the 2-variation of $\widetilde{Y}$. Inserting partition points $\{t_j | 1 \le j \le J\}$ to any finite partition of $[0,2^n]$ will not change the 2-variation of $\widetilde{Y}$ by more than multiplying a constant. Suppose $s < t_{j_1} \le t_{j_2} < t$, then

$$||\widetilde{Y}\left(s,t\right)||^2 \le 2\left(||\widetilde{Y}(s,t_{j_1})||^2 + ||\widetilde{Y}(t_{j_2},t)||^2\right),$$

where we used $\widetilde{Y}\left(t_{j_1}\right) = \widetilde{Y}\left(t_{j_2}\right)$. Thus if let $f\left(t\right) = e^{i2\pi t}$, $t \in [0,1]$, and denote

$$L := \left\|f\right\|^2_{2-var,[0,1]},$$

then, when $J \ge 1$,

$$||\widetilde{Y}||^2_{2-var} \le 2\sum_{j=0}^{J} ||\widetilde{Y}||^2_{2-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} \le 2L\left(J+1\right) \le 4LJ. \tag{62}$$

One can check that the 2-variation of unit circle is obtained by trisection, so $L = 9$. While as a crude estimation: $L = \left\|f\right\|^2_{2-var} \le \left\|f\right\|^2_{1-var} = \left(2\pi\right)^2 = 4\pi^2$.

Then, we estimate the area of Y. We decompose Y as the sum of two paths: $Y_1 + Y_2$, where Y_1 is obtained by discretizing $\widetilde{Y}$ on the basis of Y at additional points $\{t_j\}_{j=0}^J$. More rigorously, denote

$$T := \{k | k \in [0,2^n] \cap \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{t_j | j \in [0,J] \cap \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Define

$$Y_1\left(t\right) = \begin{cases} \widetilde{Y}\left(t\right) & \text{when } t \in T \\ \text{linear} & \text{between adjacent } ts \text{ in } T \\ \widetilde{Y}\left(2^n\right) & t \in (2^n,\infty) \end{cases}.$$

Thus, Y_1 starts at 1, coincides with Y at $\{k\}_{k=1}^{2^n}$ and returns to 1 at $\{t_j\}_{j=1}^J$; $Y_2 = Y - Y_1$ starts origin, and keeps returning to origin at $\{k\}_{k=1}^{2^n}$. Denote

$A_Y := A(Y)$ and $A_{Y,2} := A(Y_2)$. According to Lemma 35, since $Y_1(t_j) = 1$, $0 \leq j \leq J$, we have (here $t_0 = 0$)

$$\|A_Y\|_{1-var} \leq 2\|\widetilde{Y}\|^2_{2-var} + 2\sum_{j=0}^{J} \|A_Y\|_{1-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} + 2\sup_{\{m_k\}} \sum_{m_k < m_{k+1}} \left\|A_{Y,2}\left(t_{m_k}, t_{m_{k+1}}\right)\right\| \tag{63}$$

where we used $\|Y\|^2_{2-var} \leq \|\widetilde{Y}\|^2_{2-var}$.

First, we prove that, $\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} \leq \pi^2 + 2\|Y\|^2_{2-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]}$, for any $0 \leq j \leq J$. Denote

$$n_j := [t_j] \text{ (the integer part of } t_j). \tag{64}$$

Then $t_j \in [n_j, n_j + 1]$. Since $t_{j+1} - t_j = \frac{2\pi}{\theta} > 1$, $n_{j_1} \neq n_{j_2}$ when $j_1 \neq j_2$. Therefore, for any integer $0 \leq j \leq J - 1$, $n_j + 1 \leq n_{j+1}$. Since Y is piecewise linear obtained by interpolating on integers, so (based on the appendix) we only consider finite partitions of $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$ in the form (when there exists at least one partition point between t_j and t_{j+1}): $\{[t_j, m_0]\} \cup \{[m_k, m_{k+1}]\}_{k=0}^{K-1} \cup \{[m_K, t_{j+1}]\}$, for integers $\{m_k\}_{k=0}^{K}$ satisfying $n_j + 1 \leq m_0 < m_1 < \cdots < m_K \leq n_{j+1}$. Then

$$\|A_Y(t_j, m_0)\| \leq \|A_Y(t_j, n_j + 1)\| + \|A_Y(n_j + 1, m_0)\| + \|Y\|^2_{2-var,[t_j,m_0]},$$

$$\|A_Y(m_K, t_{j+1})\| \leq \|A_Y(m_K, n_{j+1})\| + \|A_Y(n_{j+1}, t_{j+1})\| + \|Y\|^2_{2-var,[m_K,t_{j+1}]}.$$

Since Y is linear on $[t_j, n_j+1]$ and $[n_{j+1}, t_{j+1}]$, so $\|A_Y(t_j, n_j + 1)\| = \|A_Y(n_{j+1}, t_{j+1})\| = 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \|A_Y(t_j, m_0)\| + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|A_Y(m_k, m_{k+1})\| + \|A_Y(m_K, t_{j+1})\| \\ \leq \; & \|A_Y(n_j + 1, m_0)\| + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|A_Y(m_k, m_{k+1})\| + \|A_Y(m_K, n_{j+1})\| + \|Y\|^2_{2-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} \\ \leq \; & \|A_Y\|_{1-var,[n_j+1,n_{j+1}]} + \|Y\|^2_{2-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]}. \end{aligned}$$

While if there is no partition point between t_j and t_{j+1}, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|A_Y(t_j, t_{j+1})\| \\ \leq \; & \|A_Y(t_j, n_j + 1)\| + \|A_Y(n_j + 1, n_{j+1})\| + \|A(n_{j+1}, t_{j+1})\| + 3/2\,\|Y\|^2_{2-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} \\ \leq \; & \|A_Y\|_{1-var,[n_j+1,n_{j+1}]} + 2\|Y\|^2_{2-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]}. \end{aligned}$$

Take supremum over all finite partitions of $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$, we get

$$\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} \leq \|A_Y\|_{1-var,[n_j+1,n_{j+1}]} + 2\|Y\|^2_{2-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]}. \tag{65}$$

On $[n_j + 1, n_{j+1}] \subseteq [t_j, t_{j+1}]$: If $n_{j+1} = n_j + 1$, then Y on $[n_j + 1, n_{j+1}]$ is a point, $\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[n_j+1,n_{j+1}]} = 0$; If $n_{j+1} = n_j + 2$, then on $[n_j + 1, n_{j+1}] =$

$[n_j+1,n_j+2]$, Y describes a cord of unit circle, $\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[n_j+1,n_{j+1}]}=0$; If $n_{j+1}\geq n_j+3$, then Y on $[n_j+1,n_{j+1}]$ — after connecting $Y(n_{j+1})$ with $Y(n_j+1)$ — draws a simple convex polygon, with unit circle its circumcircle, so $\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[n_j+1,n_{j+1}]}\leq\pi^2$. Combined with (65) we get

$$\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]}\leq\pi^2+2\|Y\|^2_{2-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]}.$$

Thus, we have, when $J\geq 1$, (use $\|Y\|^2_{2-var}\leq\|\widetilde{Y}\|^2_{2-var}$ and (62))

$$\sum_{j=0}^{J}\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]}\leq\pi^2(J+1)+2\|\widetilde{Y}\|^2_{2-var}\leq 2\left(\pi^2+4L\right)J. \tag{66}$$

Therefore, what left in (63) is $\sup_{\{m_k\}}\sum_{n_k<n_{k+1}}\left\|A_{Y,2}\left(t_{m_k},t_{m_{k+1}}\right)\right\|$.

From the construction of Y_1, we know that Y_1 and Y coincide on integers, and Y_1 adds additional linear structures on $[n_j,n_j+1](n_j=[t_j])$. Thus $Y_2=Y-Y_1$ can only be nontrivial on $[n_j,n_j+1]$. Moreover, since $n_{j_1}\neq n_{j_2}$ when $j_1\neq j_2$, so $t_{j'}\notin[n_j,n_{j+1}]$ when $j'\neq j$, Y_2 is linear on $[n_j,t_j]$ and $[t_j,n_j+1]$.

For $\|A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k},t_{m_{k+1}})\|$, suppose integers j_1, j_2 satisfy $j_1-1<t_{m_k}<j_1\leq j_2<t_{m_{k+1}}<j_2+1$, then ($j_1=n_{m_k}+1$, $j_2=n_{m_{k+1}}$, and) use multiplicativity of $(Y_2,A_{Y,2})$,

$$\begin{aligned}A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k},t_{m_{k+1}}) &= A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k},j_1)+A_{Y,2}(j_1,j_2)+A_{Y,2}(j_2,t_{m_{k+1}}) \\ &\quad +2^{-1}\left[Y_2(j_1)-Y_2(t_{m_k}),Y_2(t_{m_{k+1}})-Y_2(j_1)\right] \\ &\quad +2^{-1}\left[Y_2(j_2)-Y_2(j_1),Y_2(t_{m_{k+1}})-Y_2(j_2)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Since Y_2 is linear on $[t_{m_k},j_1]$ and $[j_2,t_{m_{k+1}}]$, $A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k},j_1)=A_{Y,2}(j_2,t_{m_{k+1}})=\mathbf{0}$; the last term in (67) vanishes because $Y_2(j_1)=Y_2(j_2)$. Since $Y_2(t_{m_{k+1}})-Y_2(j_1)=Y_2(t_{m_{k+1}})-Y_2(j_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k},t_{m_{k+1}})\| &\leq \|A_{Y,2}(j_1,j_2)\| \\ &\quad +2^{-1}\|Y_2(j_1)-Y_2(t_{m_k})\|^2+2^{-1}\|Y_2(t_{m_{k+1}})-Y_2(j_2)\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

For $A_{Y,2}(j_1,j_2)$, use multiplicativity of $(Y_2,A_{Y,2})$ and that $Y_2(k)=0$, $\forall k\in[0,2^n]\cap\mathbb{N}$, we get (property (10) in p6) $A_{Y,2}(j_1,j_2)=\sum_{j=j_1}^{j_2-1}A_{Y,2}(j,j+1)$. Therefore, since Y_2 can only be non-trivial on $[n_j,n_j+1]$,

$$\|A_{Y,2}(j_1,j_2)\|\leq\sum_{j,[n_j,n_j+1]\subseteq[j_1,j_2]}\|A_{Y,2}(n_j,n_j+1)\|,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}A_{Y,2}(n_j,n_j+1) &= A_{Y,2}(n_j,t_j)+A_{Y,2}(t_j,n_j+1) \\ &\quad +2^{-1}\left[Y_2(t_j)-Y_2(n_j),Y_2(n_j+1)-Y_2(t_j)\right],\end{aligned}$$

Since Y_2 is linear on $[n_j, t_j]$ and $[t_j, n_j+1]$, we have,

$$\|A_{Y,2}(n_j, n_j+1)\| \leq 2^{-1}\|Y_2(t_j) - Y_2(n_j)\|^2 + 2^{-1}\|Y_2(n_j+1) - Y_2(t_j)\|^2 .$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \|A_{Y,2}(j_1, j_2)\| \\ \leq & \sum_{j,[n_j,n_j+1]\subseteq[j_1,j_2]} 2^{-1}\left(\|Y_2(t_j) - Y_2(n_j)\|^2 + \|Y_2(n_j+1) - Y_2(t_j)\|^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Since integers $j_1,\ j_2$ satisfy $t_{m_k} \in (j_1-1, j_1)$ and $t_{m_{k+1}} \in (j_2, j_2+1)$, so according to definition of n_j, $j_1 - 1 = n_{m_k}$, $j_2 = n_{m_{k+1}}$. Combine (68) with (69), and that $j_1 = n_{m_k}+1$, $j_2 = n_{m_{k+1}}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\|A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k}, t_{m_{k+1}})\right\| \\ \leq\ & 2^{-1}\sum_{j=m_k+1}^{m_{k+1}-1}(\|Y_2(t_j) - Y_2(n_j)\|^2 + \|Y_2(n_j+1) - Y_2(t_j)\|^2) \\ & +2^{-1}\|Y_2(n_{m_k}+1) - Y_2(t_{m_k})\|^2 + 2^{-1}\left\|Y_2(t_{m_{k+1}}) - Y_2(n_{m_{k+1}})\right\|^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Thus, because $Y_2(t_j) = Y(t_j) - Y_1(t_j) = Y(t_j) - 1$, $0 \leq j \leq J$, and $Y_2(k) = 0$ for integer $k \in [0, 2^n]$, so use (70), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\{m_k\}}\sum_k \left\|A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k}, t_{m_{k+1}})\right\| \\ \leq\ & 2^{-1}\sum_{j=0}^{J}\left(\|Y_2(t_j) - Y_2(n_j)\|^2 + \|Y_2(n_j+1) - Y_2(t_j)\|^2\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{J}\|Y(t_j) - 1\|^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Since Y is linear on $[n_j, n_j+1]$, so there exists $\rho_j \in [0,1]$, s.t. $Y(t_j) = \rho_j Y(n_j) + \left(1-\rho_j\right)Y(n_j+1)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y(t_j) - 1\|^2 &= \left\|\rho_j(Y(n_j) - 1) + \left(1-\rho_j\right)(Y(n_j+1) - 1)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\left(\rho_j^2\|Y(n_j) - 1\|^2 + \left(1-\rho_j\right)^2\|Y(n_j+1) - 1\|^2\right) \\ &\leq 2\left(||\widetilde{Y}(t_j) - \widetilde{Y}(n_j)||^2 + ||\widetilde{Y}(n_j+1) - \widetilde{Y}(t_j)||^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

where we used that Y coincides with $\widetilde{Y}$ at integers, and $\widetilde{Y}(t_j) = 1$. Therefore, combine (71) and (72), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\{m_k\}}\sum_k ||A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k}, t_{m_{k+1}})|| \\ \leq\ & 2\sum_{j=0}^{J}\left(||\widetilde{Y}(t_j) - \widetilde{Y}(n_j)||^2 + ||\widetilde{Y}(n_j+1) - \widetilde{Y}(t_j)||^2\right) \leq 2||\widetilde{Y}||_{2-var}^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Therefore, when $J \geq 1$, combine (63) and (73), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_Y\|_{1-var} &\leq 2||\widetilde{Y}||^2_{2-var} + 2\sum_{j=0}^{J}\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} + 2\sup_{\{m_k\}}\sum_k \left\|A_{Y,2}(t_{m_k},t_{m_{k+1}})\right\| \\ &\leq 2\sum_{j=0}^{J}\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} + 6||\widetilde{Y}||^2_{2-var}.\end{aligned}$$

Use $||\widetilde{Y}||^2_{2-var} \leq 4LJ$ at (62) and $\sum_{j=0}^{J}\|A_Y\|_{1-var,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} \leq 2\left(\pi^2+4L\right)J$ at (66), we get

$$\|A_Y\|_{1-var} \leq 4\left(\pi^2+4L\right)J + 24LJ = 4\left(\pi^2+10L\right)J. \tag{74}$$

Finally, since

$$\|X_\theta\|^2_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} = \frac{1}{4n^2 2^n \sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}}\|Y\|^2_{2-var} \leq \frac{1}{4n^2 2^n\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}}||\widetilde{Y}||^2_{2-var},$$

combined with $||\widetilde{Y}||^2_{2-var} \leq 4LJ$ at (62), and $J \leq \frac{2^n\theta}{2\pi}$, $L \leq 4\pi^2$,

$$\|X_\theta\|^2_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} \leq \frac{LJ}{n^2 2^n\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}} \leq \frac{2\pi\theta}{\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}}\frac{1}{n^2}\ ,\ \forall n \geq \max\{\log_2(\frac{2\pi}{\theta}),1\},$$

where $n \geq \log_2(\frac{2\pi}{\theta})$ since $J \geq 1$. Similarly, for area of X_θ on $\left[2^n,2^{n+1}\right]$, use (74),

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_\theta\|_{1-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} &= \frac{1}{4n^2 2^n\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}}||A_Y||_{1-var} \\ &\leq \frac{\left(\pi^2+10L\right)J}{n^2 2^n\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}} \leq \frac{45\pi\theta}{2\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}}\frac{1}{n^2}, \forall n \geq \max\{\log_2(\frac{2\pi}{\theta}),1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{if for } \theta \in (0,2\pi)\text{, define } C_\theta = \frac{49\pi\theta}{2\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}}\text{, then}$$

$$\|X_\theta\|^2_{2-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} + \|A_\theta\|_{1-var,[2^n,2^{n+1}]} \leq \frac{C_\theta}{n^2}, \forall n \geq \max\{\log_2(\frac{2\pi}{\theta}),1\}. \tag{75}$$

Combined with the remark at the beginning of this example, proof finishes. ■

Although in the example above, (X_θ, A_θ) is of finite 2-rough norm when $\theta \neq 0$, the integration $\int_\Omega \|\mathbf{X}_\theta\|_{G^{(2)}} d\theta$ is not finite, and the problem occurs at 0 or 2π, as one may see. Moreover, after some modifications, we can push the result a little bit further. The convergent factor n^{-2} only appeared in (75), so one could adapt the example to

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{a^{\frac{1}{2}}(n)\,2^{\frac{n}{2}}}\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} e^{ik\theta} \tag{76}$$

for any positive $\{a(n)\}$ satisfying $\sum \frac{1}{a(n)} < \infty$. However, the long time behavior will then cause a problem. Denote X^1 as the process which coincides with X at $\{2^n\}$, and linear in between. According to Theorem 17, we know that if $\sum_n (\log_2 n)^2 / a(n) < \infty$, then X^1 is a geometric 2-rough process, so it will not be a problem in that case, while the local regularity is controlled by (75). In that case, based on Corollary 36(in p14), the partial sum process of (76) is a geometric 2-rough process. Therefore, we can generalize Example 50:

Example 23 *Suppose $\{w(n)\}$ is a Weyl multiplier that $n \mapsto \frac{w(n)}{(\log_2 \log_2 n)^2}$ is strictly increasing from some point on and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{w(n)}{(\log_2 \log_2 n)^2} = \infty$. Then there exists a 2-dimensional Fourier series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n e^{in\theta}$, s.t. its partial sum process is a geometric 2-rough process, but $\sum_n w(n) |c_n|^2 = \infty$.*

Proof. In light of Example 50, we only have to prove the statement for $\{w(n)\}$ growing slower than $\{\log_2(n+1)\}$. Thus, assume $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{w(2^{n+1})}{w(2^n)} = 1$. According to the condition of this example, assume $N \geq 2$ is such an integer, that $n \mapsto \frac{w(2^n)}{(\log_2 n)^2}$ is strictly increasing for all $n \geq N$. Let $r : [N-1, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a differentiable path satisfying $r'(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \geq N-1$, and

$$r(n) = \frac{w(2^n)}{(\log_2 n)^2} \text{ for all integer } n \geq N,\ r(N-1) = \frac{1}{2} r(N). \tag{77}$$

Moreover, we assume,

$$r'(n) = \frac{r(n+1) - r(n-1)}{2} \text{ for all } n \geq N,\ r'_+(N-1) = \frac{1}{2} r'(N). \tag{78}$$

Such kind of function r exists. The problem boils down to, for fixed real numbers $k > 0$, $k_1 > 0$, $k_2 > 0$, constructing a one dimensional non-decreasing differentiable function f, defined on $[0,1]$, satisfying $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) = k$, $f'_+(0) = k_0$, $f'_-(1) = k_1$, and we further require that $\int_0^t f'(s)\,ds = f(t)$, $\forall t \in [0,1]$. Then f exists, if there exists a continuous function ρ, defined on $[0,1]$, satisfying $\rho(t) \geq 0$, $\rho(0) = k_0$, $\rho(1) = k_1$, $\int_0^1 \rho(t)\,dt = k$. Such ρ clearly exists, so $f(t) = \int_0^t \rho(s)\,ds$ satisfies the condition of f. Thus, we can construct r by first setting its value at integers by (77) and (78), then on $[n, n+1]$ for integer $n \geq N-1$ use the construction of f as above. In this way, r is absolutely continuous on any finite interval $[a,b] \subseteq [N-1, \infty)$ (its derivative is continuous, so r is Lipschitz on any finite interval), thus we have $\int_a^b r'(t)\,dt = r(b) - r(a)$. As an application, use (78),

$$r'(n) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{n-1}^{n+1} r'(t)\,dt.$$

Let

$$\frac{1}{a(n)} = \frac{r'(n)}{r(n) \sqrt{(\log_2 n)^2 w(2^n)}},$$

and define

$$f(\theta) := \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a^{\frac{1}{2}}(n)\, 2^{\frac{n}{2}}} \sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} e^{ik\theta}.$$

Then since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{w\left(2^{n+1}\right)}{w(2^n)} = 1$, so $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{r(n+1)}{r(n)} = 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n\geq N} \frac{(\log_2 n)^2}{a(n)} &= \sum_{n\geq N} \frac{(\log_2 n)^2\, r'(n)}{r(n)\sqrt{(\log_2 n)^2\, w(2^n)}} = \sum_{n\geq N} \frac{r'(n)}{(r(n))^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\
&\sim \sum_{n\geq N} \frac{r'(n)}{(r(n+1))^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq \sum_{n\geq N} \frac{1}{2} \int_{n-1}^{n+1} \frac{r'}{r^{\frac{3}{2}}} dt
\end{aligned}$$

Since we know $r > 0$, $r' \geq 0$, and that r is absolutely continuous on finite interval, so

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n\geq N} \frac{1}{2} \int_{n-1}^{n+1} \frac{r'}{r^{\frac{3}{2}}} dt &= \lim_{M\to\infty} \sum_{n=N}^{M} \frac{1}{2} \int_{n-1}^{n+1} \frac{r'}{r^{\frac{3}{2}}} dt = \lim_{M\to\infty} \sum_{n=N}^{M} \frac{1}{2} \int_{n-1}^{n+1} \frac{dr}{r^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\
&\leq \lim_{M\to\infty} \int_{N-1}^{M+1} \frac{dr}{r^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \lim_{M\to\infty} 2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r(N-1)}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r(M+1)}}\right) \\
&= \frac{2}{\sqrt{r(N-1)}} < \infty. \ (\lim_{M\to\infty} r(M+1) = \infty.)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sum_{n\geq N} \frac{(\log_2 n)^2}{a(n)} < \infty$. By following exactly the same reasoning of Example 50, the partial sum process of f is a geometric 2-rough process. On the other hand, since $\{w(n)\}$ is non-decreasing, so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n\geq 2^N+1} w(n)\left|c_n\right|^2 \\
\geq\ & \sum_{n\geq N} \left(\sum_{k=2^n+1}^{2^{n+1}} \left|c_k\right|^2\right) w(2^n) = \sum_{n\geq N} \frac{w(2^n)}{a(n)} \\
=\ & \sum_{n\geq N} \frac{r'(n)\, w(2^n)}{r(n)\sqrt{(\log_2 n)^2\, w(2^n)}} = \sum_{n\geq N} \frac{r'(n)}{\sqrt{r(n)}} \geq \lim_{M\to\infty} \sum_{n=N}^{M} \frac{1}{2} \int_{n}^{n+1} \frac{r'}{\sqrt{r}} dt \\
=\ & \lim_{M\to\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{N}^{M+1} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{r}} = \lim_{M\to\infty} \left(\sqrt{r(M+1)} - \sqrt{r(N)}\right) = \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

■

6 Example of an L^2 Fourier series with infinite 2-variation almost everywhere

Before construction, we prove the upper semi-continuity of the cumulative distribution function of p-variation.

Lemma 51 *Suppose* $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *and* X *are continuous processes, defined on probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$*, taking value in* $\mathbb{R}^d$*, and* X_n *converge to* X *in distribution as* n *tends to infinity. Then for any* $p \geq 1$*,* $C \geq 0$*,*

$$\overline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} P\left(\|X_n\|_{p-var} \leq C\right) \leq P\left(\|X\|_{p-var} \leq C\right).$$

Proof. $C[0,\infty)$, the space of continuous $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued functions on $[0,\infty)$, is a complete, separable metric space when equipped with the metric:

$$\rho(\omega_1,\omega_2) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \max_{0\leq t\leq n} \left(|\omega_1(t) - \omega_2(t)| \wedge 1\right).$$

X_n and X are random variables taking values in $(C[0,\infty), \mathcal{B}(C[0,\infty)))$. According to Skorohod's theorem, there exists $\widetilde{X_n}$ and $\widetilde{X}$ on an auxiliary space, s.t. $X_n \overset{D}{=} \widetilde{X_n}$, $X \overset{D}{=} \widetilde{X}$, and $\widetilde{X_n}$ converges to $\widetilde{X}$ a.e.. Use Fatou's lemma and lower semi-continuity of p-variation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} P\left(\|X_n\|_{p-var} > C\right) \\
= \ & \underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} P\left(\left\|\widetilde{X_n}\right\|_{p-var} > C\right) \geq P\left(\underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty}\left\{\left\|\widetilde{X_n}\right\|_{p-var} > C\right\}\right) \\
= \ & P\left(\underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty}\left\|\widetilde{X_n}\right\|_{p-var} > C\right) \\
\geq \ & P\left(\left\|\widetilde{X}\right\|_{p-var} > C\right) = P\left(\|X\|_{p-var} > C\right).
\end{aligned}$$

■

As a trivial Corollary, for any $\alpha > 0$, $p \geq 1$,

$$\underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} E\left(\|X_n\|_{p-var}^{\alpha}\right) \geq E\left(\|X\|_{p-var}^{\alpha}\right) \tag{79}$$

Corollary 52 *Suppose* S_k *is the sum of first* k *terms of a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with mean* 0 *and variance* 1*. Define* ξ_n *as the continuous path on* $[0,1]$ *obtained by interpolating* $S_k/n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ *at* k/n*,* $1 \leq k \leq n$*. Then for any* $C \geq 0$*,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P\left(\|\xi_n\|_{2-var} > C\right) = 1.$$

Proof. ξ_n converge in distribution to the Wiener process W, use Lemma 51, we get

$$\underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} P\left(\|\xi_n\|_{2-var,[0,1]} > C\right) \geq P\left(\|W\|_{2-var,[0,1]} > C\right) = 1.$$

■

In fact, it is proved in [21] that there exists constant $c > 0$ such that, if assume the i.i.d. random variables have finite $2 + \delta$ moment for some $\delta > 0$, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} P\left(\|\xi_n\|_{2-var}^2 \geq c \ln\ln n\right) = 1$.

If we were working with Rademacher functions, the construction would be clearer. Glue pieces of rescaled random walks together, where each piece provides sufficiently large 2-variation, then a.e. infinite 2-variation follows from Borel-Cantelli lemma. It is similar for Fourier series, only that we pick out those trigonometric functions which resemble an i.i.d. sequence. (For any m and n, $e^{2\pi in\theta}$ and $e^{2\pi im\theta}$ are never independent: suppose θ is uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$, with a binary expansion $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\theta_k 2^{-k}$, then both $\{n\theta\}$ and $\{m\theta\}$ – the fractional part of $n\theta$ and $m\theta$ – depend on $\sigma(\{\theta_k\}_{k\geq K})$ for some $K\geq 1$, comparing to Rademacher system, which is independent because $r_k = 2\theta_k - 1$.) However, there are far more trigonometric sequences, which do not exhibit random behavior, but with a heavy L^2 tail and infinite 2-variation almost everywhere.

Suppose we have a sequence of integers $\overbrace{n_1, n_1, \ldots, n_1}^{m_1}, \ldots, \overbrace{n_k, n_k, \ldots, n_k}^{m_k}, \ldots$ where n_k, m_k, $k\geq 1$ are integers. Denote the partial sum of this sequence as $s_0 = 0$, $s_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k} m_j n_j$. Suppose θ is uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$, and θ_k is the kth digit of the binary expansion of θ, i.e. $\theta = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\theta_k 2^{-k}$. One can check that $\{\theta_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ are i.i.d. random variables satisfying $P(\theta_k = 1) = P(\theta_k = 0) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Definition 53 *Define a sequence of random variables*

$$\varsigma_i^{(n_k)} = \cos\left(2\pi\sum_{j=1}^{n_k}\frac{\theta_{s_{k-1}+(i-1)n_k+j}}{2^j}\right),\ \ 1\leq i\leq m_k,\ k\geq 1, \tag{80}$$

where m_k, n_k, s_k, *and* θ_k *are defined above.*

$\{\varsigma_i^{(n_k)}, 1\leq i\leq m_k, k\geq 1\}$ are independent with mean 0 variance $\frac{1}{2}$, and for each fixed k, $\{\varsigma_i^{(n_k)}, 1\leq i\leq m_k\}$ are identically distributed. Moreover,

$$\left|\varsigma_i^{(n_k)} - \cos\left(2\pi 2^{s_{k-1}+(i-1)n_k}\theta\right)\right| \leq \frac{\pi}{2^{n_k-1}}. \tag{81}$$

Suppose X and Y are respectively the partial sum process of

$$f(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{k\sqrt{m_k}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_k}\cos\left(2\pi 2^{s_{k-1}+(j-1)n_k}\theta\right) \text{ and } \varsigma = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{k\sqrt{m_k}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_k}\varsigma_j^{(n_k)}.$$

Then by showing that Y is of infinite 2-variation a.e., and choosing n_k and m_k to control the cumulated error produced by (81), we can prove that X of infinite 2-variation a.e.. However, the estimation in Example 24(in p9) forces us to choose m_k before n_k. Therefore, we need a result of uniform growth of 2-variation of random walks produced by $\varsigma_i^{(n_k)}$ for different ks.

Definition 54 *Define* Y_m^n *as the continuous process on* $[0,1]$ *by interpolating* $\sum_{i=1}^{k}\varsigma_i^{(n)}/m^{\frac{1}{2}}$ *at* $\frac{k}{m}$, $1\leq k\leq m$, *where* $\varsigma_i^{(n)}$, $1\leq i\leq m$, *are as defined in (80).*

Lemma 55 *For any constant* $C\geq 0$,

$$\underline{\lim}_{m\to\infty}\underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} P\left(\|Y_m^n\|_{2-var} > C\right) = 1.$$

Proof. Suppose $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^{m}$ are independent random variables uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$, and Y_m the continuous process got by interpolating $(\sum_{i=1}^{k}\cos\theta_i)/m^{\frac{1}{2}}$ at $\frac{k}{m}$. Since $P(\varsigma_i^{(n)} = \cos(2\pi k 2^{-n})) = 2^{-n}$, $0 \leq k \leq 2^n - 1$, so $\varsigma_i^{(n)}$ converge to $\cos\theta_i$ in distribution as $n \to \infty$. Noting that m is fixed, and $\varsigma_i^{(n)}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, are independent, so Y_m^n converge to Y_m in distribution as $n \to \infty$. Use Lemma 51 and Corollary 52,

$$\begin{aligned}&\underline{\lim}_{m\to\infty}\underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty}P\left(\|Y_m^n\|_{2-var,[0,1]} > C\right)\\ &\qquad\qquad\geq \underline{\lim}_{m\to\infty}P\left(\|Y_m\|_{2-var,[0,1]} > C\right) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

■

Now, we are prepared to construct our series.

Example 24 *There exists an L^2 Fourier series whose partial sum process has infinite 2-variation almost everywhere.*

Proof. According to Lemma 55, there exists a sequence of integers, $\{M_s\}_{s\geq 2}$, s.t. $\forall m \geq M_s$, $\exists N(s,m)$, s.t. $\forall n \geq N(s,m)$,

$$P\left(\|Y_m^n\|_{2-var}^2 > s^2\right) \geq \frac{1}{s}.$$

Set $m_k := \max_{1\leq s\leq k} M_s$. Choose $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, s.t. $n_k \geq N(k, m_k)$, $2^{n_k} > k\sqrt{m_k}$, and $n_{k+1} > n_k$. Hence,

$$P\left(\left\|Y_{m_k}^{n_k}\right\|_{2-var}^2 > k^2\right) \geq \frac{1}{k}, \text{ and } \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{\sqrt{m_k}}{k2^{n_k}} < \infty.$$

Denote Y as the continuous process constructed on $[0,\infty)$ by patching up $Y_{m_k}^{n_k}/k$, $k \geq 2$. Then based on the elementary inequality: $a^2 \geq b^2/2 - (a-b)^2$, we have: (X is the partial sum process of corresponding Fourier series)

$$\|X\|_{2-var}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\|Y\|_{2-var}^2 - \left(2\pi\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{\sqrt{m_k}}{k2^{n_k}}\right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\|Y\|_{2-var}^2 - C.$$

Noting that $Y_{m_k}^{n_k}$, $k \geq 1$, are independent, use Borel-Cantelli lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left(\|X\|_{2-var}^2 = \infty\right)\\ \geq\ & P\left(\|Y\|_{2-var}^2 = \infty\right) \geq P\left(\overline{\lim}_{k\to\infty}\left\{\left\|\frac{Y_{m_k}^{n_k}}{k}\right\|_{2-var}^2 > 1\right\}\right) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

■

In fact, the method above can be applied to all orthogonal systems in the form $\{\varphi(nx)\}_{n\geq 1}$, $x \in [0,1]$, where φ is an α-Hölder continuous function, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.

7 Appendix

In this section, we prove that, for p-rough norm of piecewise linear paths, $2 \leq p < 3$, one only need to consider finite partitions with all its points "edge points".

Lemma 56 *Suppose* a, b, c, d, e *are in Banach space* $(\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$, *and* $p \in [1, \infty)$. *Define function* $f : [0,1] \to \overline{\mathbb{R}^{+}}$ *by* $f(t) = \|a + tb\|^{p} + \|(1-t)c + d\|^{p}$. *Then*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} f(t) \leq \max\{f(0), f(1)\}, \tag{82}$$

Proof. When $p = 1$, for any fixed $t \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|a + tb\| + \|(1-t)c + d\| \\ \leq\ & (1-t)\|a\| + t\|a+b\| + t\|d\| + (1-t)\|c+d\| \\ \leq\ & (1-t)(\|a\| + \|c+d\|) + t(\|a+b\| + \|d\|). \end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum over all $t \in [0,1]$, (82) holds when $p = 1$.

Suppose $1 < p < \infty$. (82) holds when $t = 0$ or 1, so suppose $t \in (0,1)$. For fixed $t \in (0,1)$, use Hölder inequality: for any $k_1 > 0$, $k_2 > 0$,

$$\|a + tb\| \leq (k_1 + k_2)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{(1-t)^{p}}{k_1^{\frac{p}{q}}} \|a\|^{p} + \frac{t^{p}}{k_2^{\frac{p}{q}}} \|a+b\|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

where $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$. Then, let $k_1 = 1-t$, $k_2 = t$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|a + tb\|^{p} & \leq (1-t+t)^{\frac{p}{q}} \left((1-t)^{p-\frac{p}{q}} \|a\|^{p} + t^{p-\frac{p}{q}} \|a+b\|^{p} \right) \\ & = (1-t)\|a\|^{p} + t\|a+b\|^{p}. \end{aligned}$$

where $p - \frac{p}{q} = p\left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) = 1$. Same reasoning applies to $\|(1-t)c + d\|^{p}$, i.e.

$$\|(1-t)c + d\|^{p} \leq (1-t)\|c+d\|^{p} + t\|d\|^{p}.$$

$$\text{Thus,} \quad \begin{aligned} & \|a + tb\|^{p} + \|(1-t)c + d\|^{p} \\ \leq\ & (1-t)(\|a\|^{p} + \|c+d\|^{p}) + t(\|a+b\|^{p} + \|d\|^{p}). \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

Take supremum over all $t \in (0,1)$, proof finishes. ■

Using this Lemma, for any finite partition of finite interval J, we can always replace "a point between edge points" by some "edge point", without decreasing their l^{p} sum.

For finite interval $I = [a,b]$, denote $\gamma(a,b) := \gamma(b) - \gamma(a)$ as the increment of path γ over I.

In the following, we assume $p \in [1, \infty)$, *and* $\gamma : [0,n] \to (\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ *is a continuous piecewise linear path obtained by interpolating on integers* $\{k\}_{k=0}^{n}$.

Proposition 57 *For any* $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{K}$ *satisfying* $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_K = n$*, there exists a sequence of integers* $\{n_j\}_{j=0}^{J}$*,* $0 = n_0 < n_1 < \cdots < n_J = n$*, such that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\gamma(t_{k-1}, t_k)\|^p \leq \sum_{j=1}^{J} \|\gamma(n_{j-1}, n_j)\|^p .$$

Proof. If $K = 1$, then there are only two points in the finite partition: 0 and n, both of them are integers. Suppose $K \geq 2$, and that not all t_ks are integers. We progress from $k = 1$ to $k = K - 1$. Denote $l := \min\{k | t_k \text{ is not an integer}\}$, then $1 \leq l \leq K - 1$. Fix t_{l-1} and t_{l+1}, where t_{l-1} is an integer according to the definition of l. Denote $m := t_{l-1}$ and $b := t_{l+1}$.

If $b \leq m + 1$, then $m < t_l < b \leq m + 1$. Since m is an integer, and γ is linear on $[m, m+1]$, so

$$\gamma(t_l) = \frac{b - t_l}{b - m}\gamma(m) + \frac{t_l - m}{b - m}\gamma(b),$$

and since $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\gamma(m, t_l)\|^p + \|\gamma(t_l, b)\|^p = ((\frac{t_l - m}{b - m})^p + (\frac{b - t_l}{b - m})^p) \|\gamma(m, b)\|^p \\ \leq \ & (\frac{t_l - m}{b - m} + \frac{b - t_l}{b - m}) \|\gamma(m, b)\|^p = \|\gamma(m, b)\|^p . \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in this case, we remove t_l from the partition.

If $b > m + 1$, then there exists integer m_1, $m \leq m_1 < m_1 + 1 \leq b$, such that $t_l \in (m_1, m_1 + 1)$. Thus $\gamma(t_l) = (m_1 + 1 - t_l)\gamma(m_1) + (t_l - m_1)\gamma(m_1 + 1)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\gamma(m, t_l)\|^p + \|\gamma(t_l, b)\|^p \\ = \ & \|\gamma(m, m_1) + \gamma(m_1, t_l)\|^p + \|\gamma(t_l, m_1 + 1) + \gamma(m_1 + 1, b)\|^p \\ = \ & \|\gamma(m, m_1) + (t_l - m_1)\gamma(m_1, m_1 + 1)\|^p \\ & + \|(m_1 + 1 - t_l)\gamma(m_1, m_1 + 1) + \gamma(m_1 + 1, b)\|^p . \end{aligned}$$

Since $m_1 + 1 - t_l > 0$, $t_l - m_1 > 0$, and $m_1 + 1 - t_l + t_l - m_1 = 1$, thus according to Lemma 56,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\gamma(m, t_l)\|^p + \|\gamma(t_l, b)\|^p \\ \leq \ & \max\{\|\gamma(m, m_1)\|^p + \|\gamma(m_1, b)\|^p, \|\gamma(m, m_1 + 1)\|^p + \|\gamma(m_1 + 1, b)\|^p\} \\ : \ & = \max\{C_{m_1}, C_{m_1+1}\} . \end{aligned}$$

Then if $C_{m_1} \geq C_{m_1+1}$, we replace t_l by m_1, otherwise replace t_l by $m_1 + 1$.

Therefore, either by deleting t_l or replacing t_l by an adjacent integer point, the sequence $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{l}$ is replaced by a sequence of integers $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{l-1}$ or $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{l-1} \cup \{m_1 \text{ or } m_1 + 1\}$, while without decreasing their l^p sum.

Continue this process for $\{t_k\}_{k=l+1}^{K}$ by denoting $l' := \min\{k \geq l + 1 | t_k \text{ is not an integer}\}$, so on and so forth. The process will terminate since the sequence $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{K}$ is finite. ■

Similar result holds for area of γ.

Proposition 58 *Suppose* $A := A(\gamma)$ *is the area function of* γ*. Then for any* $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{K}$ *satisfying* $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_K = n$*, there exists a sequence of integers* $\{n_j\}_{j=0}^{J}$*,* $0 = n_0 < n_1 < \cdots < n_J = n$*, such that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \|A(t_{k-1}, t_k)\|^p \leq \sum_{j=1}^{J} \|A(n_{j-1}, n_j)\|^p .$$

Proof. Same as above, denote $l := \min\{k | t_k \text{ is not an integer}\}$, and $m := t_{l-1}$, $b := t_{l+1}$.

If $b \leq m+1$, then $m < t_l < b \leq m+1$. Since γ is linear on $[m, m+1]$, so $\|A(m, t_l)\|^p = \|A(t_l, b)\|^p = \|A(m, b)\|^p = 0$. In this case, we remove t_l.

If $b > m+1$ and $t_l \in (m_1, m_1+1)$ for some integer $m_1 \in [m, b)$, then $\gamma(t_l) = (m_1 + 1 - t_l)\gamma(m_1) + (t_l - m_1)\gamma(m_1 + 1)$. Thus since $A(m_1, t_l) = 0$,

$$A(m, t_l) = A(m, m_1) + 2^{-1}(t_l - m_1)[\gamma(m, m_1), \gamma(m_1, m_1 + 1)] .$$

Similar result holds for $A(t_l, b)$:

$$A(t_l, b) = A(m_1 + 1, b) + 2^{-1}(m_1 + 1 - t_l)[\gamma(m_1, m_1 + 1), \gamma(m_1 + 1, b)] .$$

Since $m_1 + 1 - t_l > 0$, $t_l - m_1 > 0$, and $m_1 + 1 - t_l + t_l - m_1 = 1$, thus according to Lemma 56, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|A(m, t_l)\|^p + \|A(t_l, b)\|^p \\ \leq \; & \max\{\|A(m, m_1)\|^p + \|A(m_1, b)\|^p, \|A(m, m_1 + 1)\|^p + \|A(m_1 + 1, b)\|^p\} \\ : \; & = \max\{C_{m_1}, C_{m_1+1}\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, replace t_l by m_1, if $C_{m_1} \geq C_{m_1+1}$; otherwise, replace t_l by $m_1 + 1$.

Continue this process for $\{t_k\}_{k=l+1}^{K}$, by defining $l' := \min\{k \geq l+1 | t_k \text{ is not an integer}\}$, so on and so forth. ■

References

[1] Alexits, G., *Convergence problems of orthogonal series*, Pregamon, (1961).

[2] Banach, S., Sur la divergence des series orthogonales. *Studia Math.* **9**, 139-154, (1940).

[3] Carleson, L., On convergence and growth of partial sums of Fourier series, *Acta. Math.* **116**, 135-157, (1966).

[4] Fefferman, C., Pointwise convergence of Fourier series, *Ann of Math*, **98**(3), 551-571, (1973).

[5] Friz, P., Victoir, N., *Multidimensional Stochastic Processes as Rough Paths, Theory and Applications*, CambridgeUniv. Press, (2010).

[6] Jones, R. L., Wang, G., Variation inequalities for the Fejér and poisson kernels, *Tran. Amer. Soci.*, **356**(11), 4493-4518, (2004).

[7] Hambly, B. M., Lyons, T. J., Stochastic area for Brownian motion on the Sierpinski gasket. *Ann. Probab.* **26**(1), 132–148, (1998).

[8] Hara, K., Lyons, T. J., Smooth rough paths and the applications to Fourier analysis, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana.* **23**(3), 1125-1140, (2007).

[9] Hunt, R., On the convergence of Fourier series, Proceedings of the Conference on Orthogonal Expansions and their Continuous Analogues. Southern Illinois Univ. Press, (1968).

[10] Kashin, B. A., Saakyan, A. A., *Orthogonal Series,* American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (1989).

[11] Kress, R., *Linear Integral Equations*, Springer, (1989).

[12] Lewko, A., Lewko, M., Estimates for the square variation of partial sums of Fourier series and their rearrangements, (2011).

[13] Lewko, A., Lewko, M., An Exact Asymptotic for the Square Variation of Partial Sum Processes, (2011).

[14] Lyons,T. J., Differential equations driven by rough signals (I): an extension of an inequality of L. C. Young. *Mathematical Research Letters* **1** (1994), 451-464.

[15] Lyons, T. J., Caruana, M., Lévy, T., Picard, J., *Differential equation driven by rough paths.* Springer, (2007).

[16] Lyons, T. J., Qian, Z., *System control and rough paths.* OxfordUniv. Press, (2002).

[17] Lyons, T.J., Zeitouni, O., Conditional exponential moments for iterated Wiener integrals. *Ann. Probab.* **27**(4), 1738-1749, (1999).

[18] Mensov, D., Sur les séries de fonctions orthononales, *Fund. Math.* **4**, 82-105 (1923).

[19] Oberlin, R., Seeger, A., Tao, T., Thiele, C., Wright, J., A variation norm Carleson theorem, (2010).

[20] Olevskii, A. M., Divergent series in L^2 with respect to complete systems, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR,* **138**, 545-548, (1961).

[21] Qian, J., The p-variation of partial sum processes and the empirical process, *Ann. Probab.*, **26**(3), 1370-1383 (1998).

[22] Rademacher, H., Einige Sätze über Reihen von allgemeinen Orthogonal funktionen. *Ann. Math.* **87**, 112-138, (1922).

[23] Tandori, K., Über die orthogonalen funcktonen I. *Acta. Sci. Math.*, **18**, 236-253, (1957).

[24] Victoir, N. B., Levy area for the free Brownian motion: existence and non-existence, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **208,** 107-121 (2004).

[25] Weyl, H., Über die Konvergenz von Reihen, die nach Orthogonal funktionen fortschreiten, *Ann. Math.* **67**(2), 225-245, (1909).

[26] Wiener, N., The quadratic variation of a function and its Fourier coefficients. *J. Math. Phys.* **3,** 72-94, (1924).

[27] Young, L. C., An inequality of Hölder type, connected with Stieltjes integration. *Acta Math.* **67** (1936), 251-282.

[28] Zahorski, Z., Une series de Fourier permutee d'une fonction de classe L^2 divergente presque partout, *C. R. Acad. Sci.* (Paris), **251**, 501-503, (1960).

[29] Zygmund, A., *Trigonometric series*, CambridgeUniv. Press, 3rd ed, (2002).